

THE RAMBLER.

VOL. VI. *New Series.*

MARCH 1862.

PART XVIII.

THE REVISED EDUCATIONAL CODE.

THE action of Government under the Revised Educational Code is confined to a system of contributions in aid of schools originated by private individuals and partly maintained by their subscriptions; so that every school must be under local management before the State will recognise or assist it. The local managers of twelve thousand primary schools form a large and heterogeneous body, where, as in other similar bodies, the average of intelligence will not be high. Except in considerable towns, and often even there, school-managers every where are the clergy, always characterised by conservatism and aversion to change. Conceding, then, for the sake of argument, that Mr. Lowe's celebrated Minute may be sustained by sound reasons, we still believe that it cannot be worked, because school-managers of all creeds reject it. The alternative before Government, if they decline to abandon the Code, is to see schools every where relapsing into the degraded condition from which public aid and supervision have for twenty years been gradually raising them. A universal panic will pervade the ranks of school-managers, and popular education in England will be a ruined cause. With her Majesty's present Ministers this consideration will carry more weight than even with the House of Commons. To them the event will seem more certain, and its consequences more disastrous; and we cannot anticipate that they will attempt to force the New Code upon an unwilling nation.

That the time and cost of the Royal Commission may not be wholly lost, nor the Revised Code, and all the discus-

sions upon it, remain barren and unfruitful, what remains to be done? Is it possible, while retaining the framework of the old system, with which the representatives of schools generally express satisfaction, to remove the flaws detected by the Commission, and to gain the end designed by the Code? A compromise on such a basis appears to us to be feasible.

The main object of the Revised Code is to secure the realisation of the people's wish, that primary schools should, above every thing, communicate a solid education in fundamentals to the children frequenting them; while the principal defects exposed by the Commission are the expensiveness of the old system, and the conceit and elation of some of the schoolmasters trained under it.

The State exerts influence over the teaching in schools mainly through her Majesty's inspectors. These inspectors form a numerous body, and their sagacity or discretion may not always be up to the highest mark. Left much to his own prudence, rarely communicating with his colleagues or visiting the central office, possibly young and inexperienced, perhaps led captive by a favourite pursuit or author, an inspector may easily fail to carry out the intention of the Privy Council, that rudimentary subjects should always receive his first care. He may press grammatical analysis upon children who cannot read, or physical geography upon those who cannot write, or historical theories upon those who cannot spell; and his examinations may thus become a stumbling-block and hindrance to elementary education throughout his district. The system of inspection itself seems to require organisation, in order to render it efficient for the purpose of promoting solid and suitable instruction; and whatever is needed in this direction can easily be accomplished by the Committee of Privy Council, without violent change.

Our first proposal, then, would be, that the Privy Council should take care to have their inspectors' examinations every where so conducted as to test the fundamental attainments of all school-children, and to afford no encouragement whatever to the sacrifice either of lower classes to higher classes, or of primary learning to quasi-accomplishments. Classification of school-children by age is allowed to be impracticable; nor can the examination be individual, in the sense that the inspector shall report separately upon every child, without an intolerable waste of time. Neither of these arrangements is essential to a sound and satisfactory examination.

We would not, however, rely solely upon the inspectors' examinations. The money of the State should lend its great influence. The certificated masters plead that their augmentations of salary have been guaranteed to them during good service. Let them be continued on the same terms. But an elementary schoolmaster, who fails to teach reading, writing, and arithmetic well, cannot be held to render good service. His augmentation in such a case is liable to forfeiture, and *a fortiori* to diminution. To declare it altogether forfeit, would defeat the object of the arrangement, since inspectors, actuated by the common feelings of human nature, would shrink from inflicting a punishment deemed excessive, and, as long as the choice lay between whole payment or total confiscation, would be pretty sure to let the lazy master escape. A part, however, of the augmentation might, without difficulty, be stopped for every default in teaching the three fundamental subjects. The object of the nation cannot be met by the simple alternative of paying all or nothing; and the book-keeping of the Privy Council office can, of course, preserve an accurate record of reductions, which, after all, involve no greater difficulty than the allowance of discount in ordinary commercial transactions. Let every certificated master, then, lose a portion of his allowance, if reading, or writing, or arithmetic, be not well taught in his school; or if the discipline be lax, or the registration neglected. The inspector might be required in his report to answer inquiries of the following character:—How many classes have you examined in reading? Is reading well taught? Do you recommend allowance of master's augmentation on account of reading? And the same for writing and arithmetic. Whenever the inspector declines to report affirmatively, a deduction of one quarter, or other fixed proportion, should be made in the augmentation. So powerful an incentive to teaching the rudiments would surely prove efficacious.

But yet another engine, and perhaps the most powerful of all, should be brought to bear. The methods of the training schools should be so modified as to produce a larger number of sound elementary teachers, and fewer half-educated coxcombs. These institutions, called *training schools*, are treated too much like *cramming schools*. Their success and their grants depend upon an examination, of wide range and doubtful discretion. Their teachers are encouraged, by handsome gratuities, to grasp at the learning of a University professor. Their students' powers are gauged by oratorical displays, which, though termed *lessons*, are essentially *lectures*.

Their religious and moral fruits are measured by the envy and ostentation of competitive class-lists and graduated marks. In some training schools, the sound judgment of the principals, and a healthy tradition among the students, have checked or counteracted the vicious tendency of such arrangements. Their judicious efforts might be largely aided by the Privy Council. The desired changes are neither many nor fundamental. The annual examination should be reduced in range, and limited to questions suitable for elementary teachers. The colleges could carry their students over narrower ground with greater care, and would still save time. The time thus economised in the lecture-room should be spent in the practising school. And here occurs perhaps the most important change we have to urge. The elementary school devoted in every college to the students' practice must be brought into greater prominence. It should in all cases be large and complete, comprising departments of all such kinds as any of the students may be called to teach. For example, the practising school of a female college ought not to contain merely a girls' room : it ought to have also an *infants' school*, where the students might acquire the method of teaching the youngest children ; a *mixed school*, where the discreet management of boys and girls together might be illustrated ; a *night school*, where the peculiar difficulties incident to the instruction of adults might be overcome ; and a *Sunday school*, where Christian doctrine might be attractively taught, a lending library usefully managed, and all the pious practices of a well-ordered parish lovingly encouraged. Into the practising school, so organised, students should be introduced after three months' residence, and thenceforward they should daily spend a portion of their time in one or other department, practically occupied in the duties of instruction, under the vigilant supervision of qualified officers.

It will be necessary that the comparative diligence and success of the students as teachers should be carefully tested and liberally considered in the annual examinations. There are, it is understood, two inspectors wholly employed about the twenty-seven training schools connected with the Established Church ; and they might inspect frequently and closely. By this means also the wide difference, and even contrast, known to exist in the merits of the several colleges might be gradually removed, and all of them raised to the same standard of excellence. Some of the colleges have, by a grievous error of judgment, been built at a distance from populous neighbourhoods, where children for an efficient

practising school cannot possibly be collected. In such cases, the Privy Council might reasonably require, as a condition of future aid, that each college should affiliate to itself in some well-peopled locality, conveniently situated, a large primary school, to which the students might be sent in drafts to gain that practice which is indispensable for the formation of an elementary teacher.

Together with a modification in the course of study and of consequent examination, and with a reorganisation of the practising schools, a regulation might advantageously be introduced, that every student must continue under training for at least two years, or upon leaving at the end of his first year must take service as assistant to an experienced teacher. In a shorter time than two years the training schools cannot mould the character into enduring form, or communicate an aptitude for employing good methods of instruction; and among the fundamental conditions of any successful system of national education, we should place first the sufficient training of teachers. Relying upon her own experience, Miss Nightingale has declared of nurses, that no one is worth the bread she eats—whether Catholic Nun, Lutheran Deaconess, Anglican Sister, or paid nurse—who has not been trained in the practice of an hospital. For teachers the same thing holds good. To teach well, one must, as a rule, be well trained in a perfect practising school.

Even the teachers of rural schools and dull children need training—and if any training, then a complete one; and the continuance of the plan of placing probationary teachers in small schools is immeasurably superior to the suggestion of the Code, that young persons, inexperienced and untrained, should be recognised as competent to fill small situations. Probationers, it is said, have often made extortionate demands; and the liberal allowance of Government has gone, not to assist the managers, but unduly to raise salaries. New rules might guard against this mischief; but the increase in number of trained teachers will surely apply the best, because the natural, remedy.

The adoption of some such means as we have rapidly sketched in outline would secure for the people that sound elementary education which they ask for their children, and at the same time would check the tendency to conceit, now manifested by a few ill-conditioned teachers. The third object of the Code, viz. economy, may also be gained by a moderate reform of the old system. Grants for books and some other trifling matters may be abolished. The capitation grant, if continued, may be restricted to a maximum of 10%.

to any one school; and an equal amount of voluntary subscriptions may be made an indispensable condition of every grant. Under such a regulation, the small schools would continue to receive as much aid as formerly, while comparatively little would be wasted on the larger institutions. In the case of pupil-teachers, the Government, instead of paying their whole stipend at the average rate of 15*l.* a-year, might contribute towards it a yearly sum of 10*l.*, leaving the managers free to make their own terms in reference to any further sum demanded. These two modes of economy would yearly save 30,000*l.* in capitation grants, and 60,000*l.* in payment of pupil-teachers; and if yet further reduction were demanded by the House of Commons, then the *value* of the Queen's scholarship might be brought down to 15*l.* for the female, and 20*l.* for the male scholars—the full *number* of the scholarships being still maintained. Such excisions would attack no vital part of the established system. Protecting it from abuse, they would give it fresh vigour and popularity. Primary education would flourish all the more healthfully and heartily for the loss of extravagant subsidies. *Per damna, per cædes, ab ipso ducet opes animumque ferro.*

The Ministerial explanations delivered in Parliament upon the 13th of February improve but very slightly the prospects of the New Code. The temperate and conciliatory speech of the Lord President, indeed, had it stood alone, would, with the modifications introduced by Ministers themselves, have gone far to disarm opposition, and to render probable the success of the Minute. But the Vice-President of the Education Committee, throughout a statement of much ability and more length, seems to have displayed the temper of a desperado, resolved to blow up the ship rather than lower his flag. No sagacious Minister, intending to carry out unpalatable changes through the coöperation of various classes of men, would have chosen such an opportunity to alienate the good will of all his coadjutors. Yet Mr. Lowe, knowing well the delicate position of his Code, recommends its adoption by jeering at educationists, snubbing inspectors, depreciating managers, and insulting schoolmasters. The system he has to work, the department over which he presides, the instruments at command, he vilipends them all. Irritated by the resistance to his own measures, he determines at least to ruin the scheme of another, more astute, because more successful. It is hardly conceivable that he would have thus acted, had not the abandonment of the Code been already decreed by his chiefs. For Lord

Derby and his friends are keenly alive to the popularity to be won by opposition to Mr. Lowe's statesmanship, and Lord Palmerston will never permit so easy a triumph to be snatched by his political enemies. The Code, then, may be accounted a failure.

Meantime the modifications introduced into the revision of the Revised Code, to adopt Mr. Disraeli's phrase, may be recorded. They seem designed to defeat the opposition by breaking it up. Thus, Scotland is still to enjoy the old Minutes. The training colleges, too, remain for the present untouched. Infants under six escape individual examination. Certificated schoolmasters must, as a condition of government grants, receive from their managers a salary equal to three times their augmentation. Sixteen days' attendance in the month preceding examination will not be enforced; and a larger number of children than was at first proposed may be left without a pupil-teacher or assistant to instruct them.

But nothing has been done to remove the grand objections to the Code. Managers are still invited to advance large sums of money from their own purse, on the chance of being reimbursed an indeterminate portion of it; and the government grant still depends (excepting for infants under six) upon individual examination of scholars grouped according to age. But voluntary managers, as we rest convinced, will not or cannot find money for salaries; and this one difficulty will paralyse the Code. Moreover, the separate examination of every primary scholar would consume so much time as to be practically impossible. To take an extreme example: we find among the night-schools receiving government grants one with an attendance of nearly 900 scholars. The school is open four nights in the week for two hours. With allowance for putting away shawls and bonnets, and for opening and closing school with prayers and psalmody, not more than an hour and a half each night could be taken for examination. The calculation is, that the individual examination in reading, writing from dictation, and working sums, will occupy ten minutes per head; and as the inspector must ascertain and record every scholar's name, verify his age, choose and point out a new passage for reading, dictate slowly and correct the dictation, select fresh sums and check the working of them, and record marks in each case, we think that few inspectors will get through their task in so short a time. But, at ten minutes each, an inspector in the night-school in question may in one night examine nine scholars. At the same rate

the 900 scholars will occupy him for 100 nights, or for twenty-five weeks of four nights each. And during this lengthy examination of six months, what will become of the school? And at this rate, how many inspectors will the country require?

Such a scheme is reduced to an absurdity. Its only recommendation is, that the Royal Commissioners report three-fourths of the scholars to leave school unable to read and write usefully. The school-inspectors report differently. Mr. Lowe may be right in believing the Commissioners. The dark side is oftener, perhaps, the true one. But it cannot be denied, that the visitation of the Commission was extremely partial and incomplete. They visited no Catholic schools at all; and if it be urged that Catholics must not (any more than other men) take advantage of their own wrong-doing, then we turn to the most populous county in England, which has received larger education grants than any other county. In Lancashire, the only place visited by the Commissioners was Rochdale, a third-rate town, with characteristics more nearly allied to Yorkshire than Lancashire. If, then, Scotland is exempted from the Code because the Commissioners' inquiry did not extend to that country, why not exempt the Catholic schools also, and all the Lancashire schools, excepting only those of Rochdale? To be sure, a combined phalanx of members may make a political difference in favour of Scotland; but educationally, the parts of England not visited by the Commissioners have equal right to exemption from the New Code.

Mr. Lowe argues that his scheme will be either effective or economical: effective, if through its influence the children all learn to read and write; economical, if they fail to do so, and thus forfeit grants. But it is mere mockery to recommend a system of State aid to education on the ground that under it no aid may be given; and in insisting so pertinaciously upon testing results, the Vice-President has forgotten Cicero's aphorism, familiar to him while at Oxford—*Difficilem esse causam laudare puerum: non enim res sed spes est.* In recognising the hope of youth, in accepting perfect machinery with the future prospects, the old plan proceeded not unphilosophically. The New Code tolerates nothing from children of six and upwards but positive results—*rem, quocunque modo rem*—and refuses all assistance to promising attempts. Thus it contravenes the laws of nature, and will remain ineffective; but it deserves the praise of economy no more than the miser's method of treating his horse, which miserably perished just when it had been taught to subsist upon one straw a day.

MORAL LAW AND POLITICAL LEGISLATION.

WHEN M. de Tocqueville had read Prince Albert de Broglie's excellent volumes on the Church and the Empire in the Fourth Century, he wrote to the Prince to propound a great question, which had already often troubled him, but which was brought before him with new force by the work he had just read. How is it, he asked, that the influence of Christianity should be so successful in reforming mankind, and so unsuccessful in reforming society; that it should make men more virtuous, and yet more indifferent to public virtue; that it should regulate the family, and leave the State in all its corruption?

The answers which have been given, explicitly or implicitly, to this question may be reduced to two. One asserts that Christianity has nothing to do with politics, and what is called public virtue; the other asserts that Christianity includes public virtue, and that its political failure is only the failure of public men to carry out its political principles, since, wherever they have been faithfully and earnestly carried out, their success has been complete. Let us examine these two answers in order.

1. It is true that Christianity has no direct power over the State or over public virtue. It cannot make the constitutional coward a brave and warlike patriot, nor the idler of the tropics a laborious producer. All China might be converted, and every man in it sanctified for heaven, and still the empire would not be saved if the materials were wanting for statesmen, generals, and soldiers,—if there were no political sense and commercial energy. Christianity can inspire, regulate, and mould, but it cannot create materials. This is true even in the spiritual order. "The reform of the religious orders," it has been truly said, "is scarcely more in the power of the Church than their foundation. . . . To found a religious order requires men specially raised by God. . . . The Church encourages such men, but does not create them by an authoritative act. And could it be otherwise with reform, which is still more difficult than foundation?" In like manner, but more emphatically, the Church is powerless to erect or to preserve a State where the physical and political conditions are wanting. This is why she could only linger, but could not save, the Roman Empire. None of the fathers expected a long career for Christianity; for they saw that the Roman people had become hopelessly decrepit,

and they thought the barbarians hopelessly savage. The great men of the period shone with the red glare of a sunset; their passions were those of a Tacitus,—anger, weariness, despair, that fruitless retrospection of a dying man which promises nothing for the future, founds nothing for posterity. Such was the nature of her materials, and the Church could not build with them.

But it does not follow from this that the Church has nothing to do with politics and with the State. Christianity has promise “both of the world that now is and of that which is to come.”* Whatever is promised by God is an object which He holds up to our hope and endeavour. To deny the religiousness of this hope and endeavour, is to deny that God made the promise. Yet the declaration of the Apostle is founded on two distinct promises of our Lord; and its practical interpretation during eighteen centuries of combat, especially by the Popes who founded their temporal power, and by the faithful who defend it as a right, proves that Christianity has a double end,—one subordinate and temporal, the regeneration and progress of society; the other supreme and spiritual, the salvation of the individual soul.

Christianity, then, is one, but has two distinct objects, approached by distinct paths. She conducts the individual soul to heaven by personal and subjective morality; and she tries to mould a civil society wherein the principles of positive and objective morality are publicly acknowledged, where the atmosphere of opinion and habit helps men both to know and to do their duty. These two ends are as distinct as are their respective subjects, the mortal man and the immortal soul. Society is only a temporary organisation of fleeting atoms, and has its being in time and for time. The soul is deathless, and looks for its perfection on the other side the grave, in eternity.

It is by its temporal end that Christianity enters into relations with the State. To deny these relations degrades the State, and leaves it only charged with material functions. In reality, the Christian state, on the contrary, carries out the earthly and temporal end of the Church; it is a moral institution, for moral ends, and employs moral as well as physical means. It has its obligations of duty and obedience, its sacrifices in taxation and defence, its criminal jurisdiction, and its punishment of death. Thus what the Christian Church does for the next world, the State does for this; it realises on earth the moral order of heaven: the Church for the soul, the State for society. The Church does not kill the

* 1 Tim. iv. 8.

sinner, but gives him time to repent. The State puts the criminal to death, though he dies impenitent and goes to hell. For the Church looks to the salvation of the soul beyond the grave, the State to the salvation of society on this side the grave. The Church and the State differ, in that, materially, their respective ends are separated by the grave. They are alike, in that they have substantially the same moral end. This community both enables and authorises the Church to become the counsellor and guide of the State.

2. Does, then, the political failure of Christianity, which Tocqueville laments, result from the failure of the State to listen to the counsels of the Church? This is the solution offered in such books as Mr. Digby's *Ages of Faith*. In proportion, he would say, as the principles implied in the beatitudes have been the motives of public action, States have been prosperous and progressive; in proportion as these principles have been neglected, States have sunk into misery and ruin. It is true that, in the history of Christendom, we repeatedly find periods in which the corruption of society was only to be cured by the heroic remedies of Christian asceticism. When, in the fourth century, almost whole populations in the East emigrated from the cities into the desert, and assumed the habit of monks, St. Chrysostom assures us that, if the moral and political state of the cities had been endurable, there would have been no need of leaving them. But social degradation had then reached its lowest depth. Government gave no guarantee for justice, but ground down every citizen with taxation. Riches were worshiped only as means for debauchery; poverty was degraded, and labour was hateful, where it was not impossible through the tax-gatherer's having seized the poor man's plough and oxen for arrears of tithe. All classes despaired. Vice was preferred to marriage, and even the virtuous did not care to become parents of an offspring destined to inherit the curse of the earth's closing years. The race had become sterile and effete. The despotism of the Cæsars had destroyed liberty, and effaced all social organisation; and society was reduced to a mass of unconnected atoms, like a sea of water or a wilderness of sand. Above it was the omnipotent State, with its eye and hand in every thing, claiming soul and body as its own, crushing the beginning of every reform, lest an organisation strong enough to resist the torrent of corruption should come to be able to resist the officers of the State.

This condition of society caused a real emigration from the cities into the desert, on a scale unknown to the modern world, but beheld at intervals by the East and by Europe,

from the fourth century to the fourteenth. And in this emigration were discovered the seeds of the reform which was to regenerate society. The rule of the monks,—poverty, chastity, and obedience,—adopted by them as the exact opposite of the vices which they abhorred, turned out, in its mode of action, to be an instance of spiritual homœopathy, curing like by like, instead of contraries by contraries. The degradation and vices of pauperism were cured by voluntary poverty; the true remedy against the depopulation of the world was found in chastity; and the levelling despotism of the pagan State, and the dishonourable submission of a slavish people, were healed by a rule which allowed absolute authority to the abbot, and prescribed “servile obedience” to the monk.

For the ten centuries during which the monks appeared and predominated in history were a period when social questions had become political; when the controversy was no longer about the details of policy merely, but about the preservation of a people to be the objects of political manipulation. The towns were empty, the race was exhausted, demoralised, and sterile; and if the population could have increased, it must have died of famine, when labour was dishonoured. The poverty of the monks showed that there was something more honourable than wealthy debauchery; it restored honour to labour, teaching thereby a lesson as needful for the destructive barbarians as for the listless Romans; and by the products of its labour palliated the degradation and squalor of the corrupted and despairing citizens. Similarly, the celibacy of the monks did more than the *Lex Julia* and the *Lex Papia Poppæa* of Augustus could do:—it discredited the abominations which were an obstacle to the multiplication of mankind. But monastic obedience was a far more direct cure for political servitude. The Christian emperors had relinquished no part of the rights over both soul and body which the pagan State had usurped, and allowed no centres of authority, whether spiritual or civil, to compete with their claims. But the same causes which drove the monks into the desert also forced them to gather round abbots, and thus gradually ranged them into orderly systems, and set up other centres of unity and authority over against the throne of Cæsar. The monk was equally interested in maintaining the freedom of his corporation from the State, and the authority of his corporation over its own members. Moreover, when he invited others to join his society, he was as much obliged to vindicate their independence of the State in their choice of a vocation as he was

to vindicate his own freedom from every other authority than that of his religious superior. Hence the spiritual corporation was obliged first to secure, and then to make the civil power acknowledge, its independence, and thus to set up a precedent for freedom of corporations in general in the midst of a strongly organised State.

Thus the penitential canon—"sin is purged by the same quality as belongs to its origin; the same quality should be present in the extinguishing cause as is found in the producing cause"—applies to more circumstances than the common publicity, or the reverse, of the sin and of the penance. Our race was taught how to restore its natural increase by men and women devoting themselves to chastity; productive labour was reëstablished in the habits and respect of the people by men vowed to a poverty which gave them no interest in the products of their labour; and a degrading political servitude found its strongest antagonist in an obedience "like that of a corpse without a will of its own," which the canonists virtually call servile, when they say that the monk *servo æquiparetur*.

But these lessons and remedies were not fitted solely for an age of social ruin; they are addressed to all time. For since population flourishes not by absolute increase, but by the harmonious and proportionate increase of numbers and of material resources, true economy consists in discovering and realising the laws of this equilibrium, in preventing the reproductive force both from being exhausted by abuse and from outrunning the means of livelihood. Ecclesiastical celibacy provided a remedy against both the physical and the economical difficulty. It restored, with virtue, the vitality of men, and it anticipated Malthus in prescribing the first "moral check" by which the balance of population and food is restored and preserved. Every one who voluntarily embraces celibacy leaves room for another household to take the place of that which he abstains from evoking from possibility into actual being, and abandons to another the means of obtaining the enjoyment which he denies himself; thus narrowing the area of that internecine struggle for life which must be the lot of all living creatures in a world where the means of life are limited. Thus there is an element of economic beneficence in the vow of chastity which the monk makes for the good of his soul. The same is true of his vow of poverty: he sows that he may reap in the next world; but his neighbours reap in this world the harvest he has sown. The self-denying labour of those who have nothing to gain by the fruits of their toil, except the

merit of the act and the occupation of their faculties, involves the smallest possible investment of capital, the lowest possible wages of labour, and the greatest possible zeal.

The political lesson taught by free corporations is one too important to be briefly treated. Here we need only ask our readers to note how irreconcilable is the freedom of the monastic corporation with modern as well as with ancient despotism. A government that seeks absolute power either abolishes monasteries or deprives them of their liberty, whether by the *commendam*, or by usurping their regulation and treating them as departments of official life.

Poverty, chastity, and obedience are the outward shapes of the ascetic life ; but that life has also an inward idea, which is embodied in the moral theology of the confessional. In this view, asceticism is the personal appropriation and exercise of the Christian law. Through it, the universal law becomes personal, the objective rule becomes subjective. In this modification we may note three particulars. (1) Whereas the absolute or objective moral law regards the rule only, the applied or subjective law looks mainly to the intention of the act, to its circumstances, and to the end for which it is done. (2) The absolute law exacts compensation for all wrong ; but the applied law admits in many cases internal repentance as a substitute for an equivalent material satisfaction. (3) The absolute law estimates acts and states of life only by their intrinsic lawfulness or unlawfulness ; but the applied law estimates them also by the occasions of sin which they are apt to give. The confessor, though he instructs by the principles of objective morals, judges and advises by those of subjective morals ; he judges by the intention, he advises by his knowledge of the particular things that are occasions of sin to the particular penitent, and he accepts repentance as replacing innocence. Now each of those subjective particulars has been the occasion of a great reform in the idea of objective morality. The pagan, to whom law came as an externally imposed code, saw in the difference of laws in different countries a proof that all law was arbitrary and conventional. To make law more personal and subjective always threatened to introduce a fresh cause of uncertainty ; but in reality law has by this means been brought back to its true origin—the voice of the Creator, speaking through the conscience,—and has thus been once more invested with a character of universality and certainty almost mathematical. In like manner, the variable rule of avoiding occasions of sin would seem most apt to perpetuate the differences and variations of law ; but, in reality,

this rule, by making familiar to the people the distinction on which it was founded,—between acts essentially wrong and acts that are only wrong when they are dangerous,—has swept away the superstitious rules of paganism, which, when it acknowledged sin at all, condemned sins against the elemental purity of earth or water, or violence to the sacred beasts, more severely than sin against God or violence to man. And it was necessary that the doctrine of the efficacy of repentance should be well impressed on the people before society could abolish the clannish *vendetta*, or introduce a spirit of humanity into the penal law.

Now these facts, which must suffice as examples of the mode in which Christianity has benefited the world, might lead any one to think that if the same path were followed, every fresh step would carry us higher, and would be a fresh record of the triumph of religion in every department where she was permitted to exert her influence. Yet, on the other hand, all these facts exhibit religion as a remedy. But physic is not food, and homœopathic remedies in particular are those which, when given in large doses to a healthy patient, will produce the same symptoms which, when given in small doses to a sick man, they are said to cure. There is a time in all recoveries when remedies hitherto wholesome become hurtful. Let us follow the hint of this analogy, and see whether the political failure of religion does not result less from failing to apply ascetic principles to social and political life than from an over-anxious application of them.

Such an application of ascetic principles to social and political life may be either tumultuary and popular or scientific and legislative. The first may be expected in periods of great religious excitement, like that of the emigration of cities into the desert in the fourth century, when, in his youthful enthusiasm, St. Chrysostom hoped and prayed to see the polity and life of cities become like those of monasteries in all things save marriage;—or like that of the thirteenth century, when even marriage was looked upon as so perilous that the fathers of the fourth council of Lateran were led to add a clause at the end of their creed, to assert the possibility of salvation not only for those who professed chastity, but for the married likewise. Riches were similarly suspected when the rise of the Franciscans made voluntary poverty almost a contagious passion. In the hopeless anarchy of the 10th and 11th centuries, Christians throughout Spain, France, and Italy feared every earthly joy as dangerous; spurned art and science as toys; turned from the duties of patriots, subjects, and citizens, as belonging to a death-

stricken world ; slighted useful toil as alien to religion ; and set up the outward worship of God as the one business of life, supplanting all other occupations,—crushing and extinguishing them all under the weight of its overwhelming greatness. But when the outward worship of God is thus set up as the great business of all men, political and social ruin and degradation inevitably follow. Worth is measured by a quality which any hypocrite can assume. The processes of the intellect are scorned ; and productive labour is dishonoured, being tolerated at first only as needful to furnish the bare necessities of life, and soon ceasing to furnish these.

The fanaticism which dreams of making an exceptional life the common rule, of imposing the evangelical counsels as precepts upon all, and of transforming the whole world into a cloister, is no more profitable to religion than to politics. Bourdaloue, in one of his admirable sermons, condemns “those restless Christians who seem to seek a state of life more conducive to salvation only through disgust of that state to which their salvation is attached ; who, under show of some feigned good, always want to be something they are not, and never try to become good Christians where they are ; whose good intentions all turn out to be empty resolves that they would live more regularly if they were in states that they cannot be in, and never will be in, all the while forgetting what God is now requiring of them in the state in which they are.” No wonder, then, that the induction of all times should be, that the contagious vehemence of an exclusive ascetic spirit, which holds itself aloof from all the works of life and all the processes of reason, is that which in the long-run most panders to vice, while it shrouds infernal morals with the cloak of celestial professions.

Perhaps it scarcely required so many words to prove the evident truth, that to force the profession of an ascetic life upon all men is not the way to improve either their religiousness or their earthly welfare. But it may be different with the attempt to bring the laws and usages of society into progressive conformity with ascetic principles. The rapidity and completeness of the first victories of asceticism over social degradation, might well fill the most cautious with the hope that what had done so much was destined to do all, and that what had sanctified and saved the man and the family might equally sanctify and save society and the State ; and this hope would naturally lead religious men to try to modify the laws of society by their own principles. Let us see what has been the result of endeavouring to mould the legislation and habits of mankind by the spirit of poverty,

chastity, and obedience, and by the principles of subjective morality,—intention, repentance, and the avoidance of the occasions of sin.

It is clear that, beyond the example of purity, and the regulation of the daily intercourse between the sexes, monastic celibacy could be no rule for secular life. Neither can the poverty of monks and their community of property be any law for the world, except in the dreams of enthusiastic communists. But the monastic theory of labour has filtered into the habits of certain populations. The early monks were the fathers of modern agriculture, the architects of our noblest buildings, the makers of roads and bridges, which the apathy of the first Protestants let go to ruin; they re-domesticated animals which generations of barbarians had suffered to run wild; and rescued from destruction the records of the arts, sciences, and literature of a ruined civilisation. But the grand products of their labour were one thing, and the object for which they performed it was another. They wrought not for the work's sake, but for the workman's. To them labour was a necessary occupation, but production was not an important end: it was indifferent whether they worked with their pen or with their plough, for their work was rather meant to absorb their attention than to exercise their powers. The habits of populations inspired by this spirit cannot maintain them at the level of modern progress, for it keeps them strangers to the economical meaning of "industry." So far as this view of the ascetic code is taken, work becomes merely "occupation,"—something to engage the attention, and to leave no vacancy for evil thoughts. Labour comes to be estimated not by its products, but by the time it consumes innocently and meritoriously. Acts of devotion and charity are held to be the only solid works. The rest is negative: it consists in exercising a perpetual veto upon thoughts that might wander into forbidden ground; in avoiding occasion of sin; in doing nothing wrong; in doing nothing at all, if so a man can keep out of harm's way; at least in looking upon all occupations of hand or brain as mere stop-gaps against the intrusion of temptation,—equally insignificant, except so far as they contribute to this great end; equally indifferent, whatever difference there may be in the material worth of their products. It needs no long reasoning to enforce the lesson of experience, that this system, which strives to supersede all other rules of earthly conduct by the influence of asceticism, nullifies earthly conduct altogether, and makes men triflers who amuse themselves without vivacity, who fall into vice with-

out vigour, and who do every thing with the languid air of those who feel that they have nothing to do, nothing to care for, nothing to seek, but every thing to avoid ; a strange development of the principles of those grand old monks, who were, in strength of character, emphatically *men*.

Obedience is the most meritorious and essential part of the life of the monk, who, by an act of will still free, abdicates his freedom, gives up his legitimate rights into the hands of a superior whom he has freely chosen, and promises prompt, perfect, and absolute obedience ; and the influence of this idea has been even more important politically than socially. Successful at first as a sovereign remedy against the despotism of the Cæsars, it tended, by its continued application to the society which it had regenerated, to reproduce the symptoms which it had formerly removed. After the break-up of the Empire, religion was almost as much inconvenienced by the fragmentary state of the barbaric and feudal world as it had before been by the leaden uniformity of the imperial system. The Church remedied this state of things by borrowing from the Jews the notion of an anointed king, and thus raising up, by a divine sanction, a unitive power, which society could not at the time develop out of itself. And the Christian sovereign, a prince elected once for all by the people, but bound by a coronation oath, and answerable to the Church for its observance, became a counterpart of the Benedictine abbot, elected by his monks as their master, bound by the rule, and answerable to the Pope for its observance. It only required the civil law of imperial Rome to be grafted on the Christian monarchy, to enable the prince to throw off his responsibility to the Church ; and then his oath became a nullity, and his power became a despotism, responsible only to the revolution.

Again, the ascetic idea of obedience derived from the moral code of a theocracy, is obedience to the personal will of the supreme lawgiver and ruler. The political idea is obedience to law. The preponderance of monastic corporations naturally tended to impose the ascetic idea upon civil society ; and, as naturally, reactionary attempts were made to force upon the Church the notion of political obedience to law, instead of obedience to the supreme lawgiver. One of the glosses on the bull of Alexander III. for the truce of God questions whether such a precept is binding before it is received by the usage of the people. The canonists who took the negative side argued on the purely political principle that law is only custom declared or defined, and that without a foundation of custom no law is legitimate or binding. The

canonists and theologians who affirmed the validity of the precept insisted on the supreme power of the Pope to bind and to loose, independently of any "co-legislation" of the people,—that is, on the theocratic and ascetic idea of obedience. Here we have evidence of a contest that would never have arisen if the two spheres had been kept asunder. For political law is local and national, growing up in particular families and races, and suited to their national character, circumstances, and wants. But the law of the universal Church must be regardless of particular conditions, of historical traditions, of physical aptitudes, of ethical inclinations, and of geographical relations. The two kinds of law can only clash when one or the other is arbitrary, exclusive, and aggressive. Each has its own sphere, and the two spheres can only be in harmony when kept distinct. The first principle of political legislation is, that law should grow up out of the habits of the people, should be custom as well as precept, *mos* as well as *jus*, and should thus be the expression of the national character and life. But the first principle of religious legislation is, that the law is imposed from above, theocratically, by the organ of God's government—the Church or her supreme Pontiff.

When legislation takes the ascetic or theocratic form, and imposes upon the people a code alien to their manners, it must lead, not only by its peculiar view of obedience, but by its mechanism, to the absolutism of the State. The new system must be administered by experts, by an army of lawyers and bureaucrats. The people cannot administer a law which is not theirs, which they cannot know because they have not made it. On the other hand, self-government is built not on a code, but upon custom, and its law, the *droit coutumier*, or common law, is learnt, not from general principles and definitions, but from practice and precedent, and is administered by the people themselves, who are their own judges, jury, police, and soldiers, and who manage their local affairs by their own local officers. This kind of legislation is the secret of free growth; for it reconciles liberty, progress, and conservative tradition. Self-government supposes the common interest of all the people to maintain the law; the superimposed code produces an antagonism between the people and the law. For instance, the subject of an imposed code may reconcile it with his conscience to smuggle, because he is willing to bear the penalty if discovered; but the subject of "common law" is bound by an implied pact with all his fellow-subjects, as co-legislator with them, to observe a law in which all are equally interested, and to which all are mutually obliged.

Again, while political law only legislates for outward acts, the ascetic law legislates for the inward thought. The decree of Innocent III., that all clerks should recite the divine office *studiose et devote*, raised a question whether even ecclesiastical law can do more than regulate external acts, leaving the intention to God. The canonists answered that the Church does, in fact, legislate about the hidden motions of the mind, and punishes in the Inquisition even secret heresy of thought, whenever she can find it out. Secular legislations, claiming to be based on the ascetic principle of a divine sanction belonging to the personal lawgiver, have attempted to transport this right of the Church into their own sphere, and have tormented the subject for disloyal opinions, expressed or suspected; and States which are both secular and ecclesiastical, the existence of which depends on the belief of the people, and where consequently the preservation of the faith is the first political necessity, are led to carry out furthest this inquisitorial process. It becomes a business of State to prevent secret unbelief; but as secret thoughts do not stalk abroad in public, they can only be known when watched and denounced by spies and doctrinal detectives, who have to look upon acts which are only sins as if they were crimes, and to denounce the unbeliever as a traitor even when he has kept his unbelief to himself. Considering the infinite mobility of thought, every subject of such a State must be under misprision of treason in the eyes of the government, and under misprision of being a spy in the eyes of his fellow-subjects. Thus each man is suspected by his neighbour, society is disrupted, and the only union left to the subjects is that of the secret society, which is secret because it can only associate under such securities as it deems sufficient against delation by its members. And the community, thus broken to fragments, is also secluded from the rest of the world that believes otherwise, or is governed on other principles, for fear of the contagion of liberty. Hence poverty and that stagnation which, in the midst of progress, is really retrogression, are the lot of such states till intercommunication has destroyed the barriers, and has brought the forbidden knowledge into the sequestered community. And then follows the fatal catastrophe, which proves how revolutionary is the desire to carry out the external imitation of ascetic principles in the forms of political life. For it troubles the traditional life of a country by grafting upon it a law which never grew there naturally, and it makes progress impossible by making the law something positive and final, which may be added to

and patched up, or, on the other hand, suffered to sleep, but can never be repealed, and swept out of the way, however great an obstacle it may have become. Thus a superimposed civil code which is contrary to the habits of a people, both ignores the past and destroys the future, and, by the mechanical contrivances which are necessary for its administration and preservation, it infallibly conducts to a revolutionary outbreak against itself.

To pass from the influence of the external forms of ascetical law—poverty, chastity, and obedience—on society and legislation, to the influence of its spirit,—intention, repentance, and the occasions of sin. It is clear that the legislation which looks to the inward intention must be essentially different from that which looks only to the material result, and to the external character of the act. The first estimates acts by the way in which they spring from and react upon the will; the second estimates them by their effect on society. This distinction produces a radical difference in the standards and measures by which men brought up to one or the other system respectively estimate acts. This it is which makes the professionally educated priest so admirable and indispensable a guide for the hidden life, so often a dangerous adviser about social and political questions. This it is which makes the ecclesiastical government of the Roman States so unpopular. The professionally educated priest, as Dr. Döllinger says, “when charged with legislative and administrative functions, finds the extremest difficulty in overcoming the temptation of allowing his individual opinion, his subjective estimate of persons, his compassionateness, and his inclinations, to influence his official dealings. As priest, he is before all things the minister and herald of grace, of reconciliation, of forgiveness. Hence he too easily forgets that in social relations the law is deaf to prayer, and that every time it is bent in favour of one, it injures another, or many others, or the whole community. He gradually gets used to set his own arbitrary will, at first always with the best intention, above the law.” The professional bias of the confessional leads the clerical legislator and judge to attach more importance to the intention than to the deed; thus stimulating hypocrisy in the candidates for employment or reward, and laziness in those employed, and at the same time vitiating the penal law. Under such codes, presumed intentions, and the words which imply them, are punished more severely than the worst crimes. Murderers and brigands will be carelessly thrown back upon society after a few years’ confinement; while suspected

malcontents, whose only overt crime is one of words, will be subjected to lifelong severity. For the moral code of the confessional is full of tenderness for the poor criminal who has done all the evil he can do; but it has no absolution for the man who intends to commit a sin which he has never yet committed, and who obstinately refuses to own it or to purge himself.

The introduction of the principle of repentance into civil law is another infiltration of the subjective moral code into politics. The medieval theory of the relations of the Pope with his dependent princes was marked with this principle. The doctrine was, that as all tyranny is a punishment of the sins of the people, and all revolution a punishment of the sins of the ruler, they may, like other punishments, be wiped away by repentance. A people sins,—God sends a tyrant; it repents,—He destroys the tyrant. A prince sins, and becomes a tyrant,—God raises up foes to dethrone him; he repents,—his enemies are put down, and he is restored. If this were an account of what always works itself out in history, nothing could be more providential. But when it has to be worked out by a human tribunal, it must often leave the impression of great injustice. For instance, suppose John is a tyrant and apostate; the Pope thereupon adjudges his crown to be forfeit, and assigns it, let us say, to Lewis, on condition of his winning it. Lewis grasps eagerly at the prize, and after vast pains seems on the point of securing it, when John repents, makes his submission to the Pope, and claims his right of absolution and restoration. Nothing thereupon is left for Lewis but either to retire, or in turn to become the enemy of the Pope, if he perseveres. While for those of John's subjects who have helped Lewis, in obedience to the Papal decree, there is nothing left but either to submit to John, who has formerly shown himself a perfidious tyrant, or to become at once excommunicated rebels instead of soldiers of the Pope. Complications such as these are endured when they arise from the chances of war, but not when they are caused simply by a human judge applying an ecclesiastical principle to political events. Thus the infiltration of the principle of repentance into legislation frustrated the later medieval claim of the Pope to supremacy over all States in the interests of the Papacy; a claim which had grown out of his admitted consultative authority in the interests of a people oppressed by its rulers, and only awaiting his decision to throw them off.

Again, the subject of "occasions of sin" belongs to the

applied moral code ; it is altogether subjective, personal, and varies with each individual : if generalised and made objective, it often results either in an abridgment of Christian liberty, like the "Maine Liquor Law," when the rights of the strong are sacrificed to the interests of the weak, or, when no such sacrifice is made, in a useless web of ineffective precepts. There cannot be a plainer corollary of the personal duty of avoiding occasions of sin than the prohibition of bad books by the Church. She would perhaps seem to fail in her maternal care if she did not put her mark on books she considered dangerous, and if she did not furnish rules for the guidance of souls in this delicate matter. As long as these rules are subjective, and applied through the confessional, they are such as no Christian can accuse. But make them objective and general, and they at once change their nature. The law being penal, sanctioned by excommunication, and technically odious (*de re odiosa*), must be strictly interpreted, and not stretched beyond the letter. Now the excommunication being for those who knowingly retain, read, print, or defend the books of heretics, and infidels not being formally heretics, their books, though containing heresy, may be read without excommunication.* And as the reading must be done knowingly (*scienter*), a general opinion is, that not only invincible and crass ignorance excuses, but also "affected ignorance," which obviates a formal contempt of the censure. The book must be about religion, or, if not about religion, must contain an error, in order to come under the censure, under which it still remains after the single error is blotted out. Pamphlets, however, such as sermons, and perhaps manuscripts, do not come under the denomination of books ; and the books which may not be read may be listened to, if another reads.† Thus a law which is admirably adapted for the guidance of the individual soul by the confessor becomes a very uncertain and seemingly purposeless guide when made objective, and imposed as a penal law on society, and interpreted as all penal laws must be. And even then it must often be inconvenient to literary men. It is true they may obtain dispensations ; but in the very act of granting a dispensation a new feature of ascetic and subjective morality comes to light.

One object of political legislation is to simplify law and reduce it to a minimum, especially in all odious matter, so

* "Non autem incurrunt (sc. excom.) legentes libros infidelium, licet hæresim contineant."

† S. Alphonsus, Theol. Moral. tom. x. (ed. Heilig, Mechlin, 1846), Appen. de prohib. lib. cap. v. dubia 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9.

as to obtrude the authority of the legislator as little as possible on the patience of the subject. But the object of the confessor is ever to keep before the penitent's mind the presence and the authority of the supreme Legislator. Hence it is often held that, in dispensing any dispensable law, care should be taken not to excuse it entirely, but to leave some portion of it in action, lest it should become obsolete and be forgotten. Thus the dispensation permitting the literary man to read condemned books generally excepts some one class of literature, which is still forbidden. In a similar way, the customs in mitigation of fasting which are already established are connived at; but some hold that no general dispensation can be given to alter a use which has no custom against it. The legislator may connive at the breach of a law, but will not authorise the breach beforehand, or abrogate the law, because, subjectively considered, it is good that there should be many laws, in order that the lawgiver may be more frequently called to mind. If this ascetic idea is imitated in politics, it will cause an equal facility in continually putting forth new laws and new edicts, and in conniving at the breach of them,—a multiplicity of laws, continual change of laws, no obedience, and no possibility of progress.

The peculiar usages which we have shown to be derived from the infiltration of the ascetic forms—poverty, chastity, and obedience, and the subjective laws of intention, repentance, and occasions of sin—into the political law are chiefly characteristic of what is called clerical government. The demand for secularising such a government does not mean that its officers should be exclusively or even chiefly laymen, but that it should be administered on secular, not on ecclesiastical principles. What is wanted is the distinction, not the separation, of subjective and objective morals, of ascetic and political law, of Church and State. It does not matter who administers, whether clergyman or layman, provided he recognises the distinction, and has the will and the knowledge to do justice to both sides. The real secularisation wanted is one that will allow the secular government to remain secular without interfering with the ascetic principles of the canon law on which ecclesiastical affairs must be administered, and which will also make the ecclesiastical government remain ecclesiastical, without interfering with the political and economic principles on which society must govern itself.

Christianity, then, has two ends; one heavenly, the other earthly,—“having promise of the world that now is.” By

this she exerts an influence over the State which has the same earthly object, and claims a share in the direction of human progress. But her political success has not equalled her triumphs in the reformation of man and of the family. This failure is partly to be attributed to the want of an adequate distinction between the spheres of ascetic and subjective morality on the one hand, and of political and objective morality on the other. The attempts to reform society by imposing upon it the forms of ascetic life have necessarily failed. And the attempts to reform legislation by principles derived from the forms of asceticism, or from the subjective moral code, have in the long-run proved equally abortive. How, then, is the Church to influence human progress?

Her direct action is only on the individual soul, to which her beatitudes reveal a new life. But they provide no new mechanism for society. For instance, the political obedience of the early Christians differed from that of the pagans in being cheerful and willing, as if paid not to man but to God, not to force but to conscience. The Christian slave suffered more patiently than the pagan, but would not submit to moral degradation, which the pagan slave endured without resistance. This resistance to sin became resistance to wrong as soon as the State became Christian, and thus led to a more settled legality, but not necessarily to any political changes in society. Christianity civilises the nation by making the man moral; but every where she is contented with morality sufficient for heaven, though it should not be sufficient for temporal progress. She always accepts the temporal condition in which she finds her converts, however imperfect it may be. If their state of life is compatible with holiness, she requires no change in it. She leaves Chinese and Esquimaux as they were, without altering their institutions, and imposes no "Christian civilisation" upon them.

Christian civilisation is only possible when the Church finds suitable materials and the proper means. Christianity has been called the "economy of mediation" because its work is all done by mediators. Between God and man is Christ; between Christ and men the Church; between the Church and her flock the pastors; between the Church and society the Christian State; between Church and State the political classes of society. Christian civilisation is impossible, except where nature provides a race capable of receiving it, and a race capable of giving it. The Church was unable to inspire new political life into the effete and exhausted relics of the Roman world. But when the Teuton barbarians, with their bodily vigour and their unexampled political capacity,

overran the Empire, then came her opportunity for teaching the world what Christian civilisation is. That this civilisation has not yet attained its ideal of political excellence seems attributable to the mistake which we have been criticising,—the application of the ascetic idea to a sphere where it was not applicable.

THE PROTESTANT THEORY OF PERSECUTION.

THE manner in which Religion influences State policy is more easily ascertained in the case of Protestantism than in that of the Catholic Church: for whilst the expression of Catholic doctrines is authoritative and unvarying, the great social problems did not all arise at once, and have at various times received different solutions. The reformers failed to construct a complete and harmonious code of doctrine; but they were compelled to supplement the new theology by a body of new rules for the guidance of their followers in those innumerable questions with regard to which the practice of the Church had grown out of the experience of ages. And although the dogmatic system of Protestantism was not completed in their time, yet the Protestant spirit animated them in greater purity and force than it did any later generation. Now, when a religion is applied to the social and political sphere, its general spirit must be considered, rather than its particular precepts. So that, in studying the points of this application in the case of Protestantism, we may consult the writings of the reformers with greater confidence than we could do for an exposition of Protestant theology; and accept them as a greater authority, because they agree more entirely among themselves. We can be more sure that we have the true Protestant opinion in a political or social question on which all the reformers are agreed, than in a theological question on which they differ; for the concurrent opinion must be founded on an element common to all, and therefore essential. If it should further appear that this opinion was injurious to their actual interests, and maintained at a sacrifice to themselves, we should then have an additional security for its necessary connexion with their fundamental views.

The most important example of this law is the Protestant theory of Toleration. The views of the reformers on religious liberty are not fragmentary, accidental opinions,

unconnected with their doctrines, or suggested by the circumstances amidst which they lived; but the product of their theological system, and of their ideas of political and ecclesiastical government. Civil and religious liberty are so commonly associated in people's mouths, and are so rare in fact, that their definition is evidently as little understood as the principle of their connexion. The point at which they unite, the common root from which they derive their sustenance, is the right of self-government. The modern theory, which has swept away every authority except that of the State, and has made the sovereign power irresistible by multiplying those who share it, is the enemy of that common freedom in which religious freedom is included. It condemns, as a state within the State, every inner group and community, class or corporation, administering its own affairs; and, by proclaiming the abolition of privileges, it emancipates the subjects of every such authority, in order to transfer them exclusively to its own. It recognises liberty only in the individual, because it is only in the individual that liberty can be separated from authority, and the right of conditional obedience deprived of the security of a limited command. Under its sway, therefore, every man may profess his own religion more or less freely; but his religion is not free to administer its own laws. In other words, religious profession is free, but Church-government is controlled. And where ecclesiastical authority is restricted, religious liberty is virtually denied.

For religious liberty is not the negative right of being without any particular religion, just as self-government is not anarchy. It is the right of religious communities to the practice of their own duties, the enjoyment of their own constitution, and the protection of the law, which equally secures to all the possession of their own independence. Far from implying a general toleration, it is best secured by a limited one. In an indifferent State, that is, in a State without any definite religious character (if such a thing is conceivable), no ecclesiastical authority could exist. A hierarchical organisation would not be tolerated by the sects that have none, or by the enemies of all definite religion; for it would be in contradiction to the prevailing theory of atomic freedom. Nor can a religion be free when it is alone, unless it makes the State subject to it. For governments restrict the liberty of the favoured Church, by way of remunerating themselves for their service in preserving her unity. The most violent and prolonged conflicts for religious freedom occurred in the middle ages

between a Church which was not threatened by rivals and States which were most attentive to preserve her exclusive predominance. Frederic II., the most tyrannical oppressor of the Church among the German emperors, was the author of those sanguinary laws against heresy which prevailed so long in many parts of Europe. The Inquisition, which upheld the religious unity of the Spanish nation, imposed the severest restrictions on the Spanish Church; and in England conformity has been most rigorously exacted by those sovereigns who have most completely tyrannised over the Established Church. Religious liberty, therefore, is possible only where the coexistence of different religions is admitted, with an equal right to govern themselves according to their own several principles. Tolerance of error is requisite for freedom; but freedom will be most complete where there is no actual diversity to be resisted, and no theoretical unity to be maintained, but where unity exists as the triumph of truth, not of force, through the victory of the Church, not through the enactment of the State.

This freedom is attainable only in communities where rights are sacred, and where law is supreme. If the first duty is held to be obedience to authority, and the preservation of order, as in the case of aristocracies, and monarchies of the patriarchal type, there is no safety for the liberties either of individuals or of religion. Where the highest consideration is the public good and the popular will, as in democracies, and in constitutional monarchies after the French pattern, majority takes the place of authority; an irresistible power is substituted for an idolatrous principle; and all private rights are equally insecure. The true theory of freedom excludes all absolute power and arbitrary action, and requires that a tyrannical or revolutionary government shall be coerced by the people; but it teaches that insurrection is criminal, except as a corrective of revolution and tyranny. In order to understand the views of the Protestant reformers on toleration, they must be considered with reference to these points.

While the Reformation was an act of individual resistance, and not a system, and when the secular powers were engaged in supporting the authority of the Church, the authors of the movement were compelled to claim impunity for their opinions, and they held language regarding the right of governments to interfere with religious belief which resembled that of friends of toleration. Every religious party, however exclusive or servile its theory may be, if it is in contradiction with a system generally accepted and protected

by law, must necessarily, at its first appearance, assume the protection of the idea that the conscience is free.¹ Before a new authority can be set up in the place of one that exists, there is an interval when the right of dissent must be proclaimed. At the beginning of Luther's contest with the Holy See there was no rival authority for him to appeal to. No ecclesiastical organism existed; the civil power was not on his side, and not even a definite system had yet been evolved by controversy out of his original doctrine of justification. His first efforts were acts of hostility; his exhortations were entirely aggressive, and his appeal was to the masses. When the prohibition of his New Testament confirmed him in the belief that no favour was to be expected from the princes, he published his book on the Civil Power, which he judged superior to every thing that had been written on government since the days of the Apostles, and in which he asserts that authority is given to the State only against the wicked, and that it cannot coerce the godly. Princes, he says, are not to be obeyed when they command submission to superstitious errors, but their aid is not to be invoked in support of the Word of God.² Heretics must be converted by the Scriptures, and not by fire, otherwise the hangman would be the greatest doctor.³ At the time when this was written Luther was expecting the bull of excommunication and the ban of the empire, and for several years it appeared doubtful whether he would escape the treatment he condemned. He lived in constant fear of assassination, and his friends amused themselves with his terrors. At one time he believed that a Jew

¹ "Le vrai principe de Luther est celui-ci: La volonté est esclave par nature. . . . Le libre examen a été pour Luther un moyen et non un principe. Il s'en est servi, et était contraint de s'en servir pour établir son vrai principe, qui était la toute-puissance de la foi et de la grâce. . . . C'est ainsi que le libre examen s'imposa au Protestantisme. L'accessoire devint le principal, et la forme dévora plus ou moins le fond." Janet, *Histoire de la Philosophie Morale*, ii. 38, 39.

² "If they prohibit true doctrine, and punish their subjects for receiving the entire sacrament, as Christ ordained it, compel the people to idolatrous practices, with masses for the dead, indulgences, invocation of saints, and the like, in these things they exceed their office, and seek to deprive God of the obedience due to Him. For God requires from us this above all, that we hear His Word, and follow it; but where the government desires to prevent this, the subjects must know that they are not bound to obey it" (Luther's Werke, xiii. 2244). "Non est, mi Spalatine, principum et istius sæculi Pontificum tueri verbum Dei, nec ea gratia ullorum peto præsidium" (Luther's Briefe, ed. De Wette, i. 521, 4th November 1520). "I will compel and urge by force no man; for the faith must be voluntary and not compulsory, and must be adopted without violence." Sermonen an Carlstadt, Werke, xx. 24, 1522.

³ Schrift an den christlichen Adel. Werke, x. 374 (June 1520). His proposition, *Hæreticos comburi esse contra voluntatem spiritus*, was one of those condemned by Leo X. as pestilent, scandalous, and contrary to Christian charity.

had been hired by the Polish Bishops to despatch him; that an invisible physician was on his way to Wittenberg to murder him; that the pulpit from which he preached was impregnated with a subtle poison.⁴ These alarms dictated his language during those early years. It was not the true expression of his views, which he was not yet strong enough openly to put forth.⁵

The Zwinglian schism, the rise of the Anabaptists, and the Peasants' War, altered the aspect of affairs. Luther recognised in them the fruits of his theory of the right of private judgment and of dissent,⁶ and the moment had arrived to secure his Church against the application of the same dissolving principles which had served him to break off from his allegiance to Rome.⁷ The excesses of the social war threatened to deprive the movement of the sympathy of the higher classes, especially of the governments; and with the defeat of the peasants the popular phase of the Reformation came to an end on the Continent. The devil, Luther said, having failed to put him down by the help of the Pope, was seeking his destruction through the preachers of

⁴ "Nihil non tentabunt Romanenses, nec potest satis Huttenus me monere, adeo mihi de veneno timet" (De Wette, i. 487). "Etiam inimici mei quidam miserti per amicos ex Halberstadio fecerunt moneri me: esse quendam doctorem medicinæ, qui arte magica factus pro libito invisibilis, quendam occidit, mandatum habentem et occidendi Lutheri, venturumque ad futuram Dominicam ostensionis reliquiarum: valde hoc constanter narratur" (De Wette, i. 441). "Est hic apud nos Judæus Polonus, missus sub pretio 2000 aureorum, ut me veneno perdat, ab amicis per literas mihi proditus. Doctor est medicinæ, et nihil non audere et facere paratus incredibili astutia et agilitate" (De Wette, ii. 616). See also (Jarcke) *Studien zur Geschichte der Reformation*, 176.

⁵ "Multa ego premo et causa principis et universitatis nostræ cohibeo, quæ (si alibi essem) evomerem in vastatricem Scripturæ et Ecclesiæ Romam. . . . Timeo miser, ne forte non sim dignus pati et occidi pro tali causa: erit ista felicitas meliorum hominum, non tam fœdi peccatoris. Dixi tibi semper me paratum esse cedere loco, si qua ego principi ill. viderer periculo hic vivere. Aliquando certe moriendum est, quanquam jam edita vernacula quadam apologia satis aduler Romanæ Ecclesiæ et Pontifici, si quid forte id prosit" (De Wette, i. 260, 261). "Ubi periculum est, ne iis protectoribus tutus sævius in Romanenses sim grassaturus, quam si sub principis imperio publicis militarem officiis docendi. . . . Ego vicissim, nisi ignem habere nequeam damnabo, publiceque concremabo jus pontificium totum, id est, lernam illam hæresium; et finem habebit humilitatis exhibitæ hactenusque frustratæ observantia, qua nolo amplius inflari hostes Evangelii." Ibid. 465, 466. 10th July 1520.

⁶ "Out of the Gospel and divine truth come devilish lies; . . . from the blood in our body comes corruption; out of Luther come Müntzer, and rebels, Anabaptists, Sacramentarians, and false brethren." Werke, i. 75.

⁷ "Habemus," wrote Erasmus, "fructum tui spiritus. . . . Non agnoscis hosce seditiosos, opinor, sed illi te agnoscunt . . . nec tamen efficis quominus credant homines per tuos libellos . . . pro libertate evangelica, contra tyrannidem humanam, hisce tumultibus fuisse datam occasionem." "And who will deny," adds a Protestant classic, "that the fault was partly owing to them?" Planck, *Geschichte der Protestantischen Kirche*, ii. 183.

treason and blood.⁸ He instantly turned from the people to the princes ;⁹ impressed on his party that character of political dependence, and that habit of passive obedience to the State, which it has ever since retained, and gave it a stability it could never otherwise have acquired. In thus taking refuge in the arms of the civil power, purchasing the safety of his doctrine by the sacrifice of its freedom, and conferring on the State, together with the right of control, the duty of imposing it at the point of the sword, Luther in reality reverted to his original teaching.¹⁰ The notion of liberty, whether civil or religious, was hateful to his despotic nature, and contrary to his interpretation of Scripture. As early as 1519 he had said that even the Turk was to be revered as an authority.¹¹ The demoralising servitude and lawless oppression which the peasants endured, gave them, in his eyes, no right to relief ; and when they rushed to arms, invoking his name as their deliverer, he exhorted the nobles to take a merciless revenge.¹² Their crime was, that they were animated by the sectarian spirit, which it was the most important interest of Luther to suppress.

The Protestant authorities throughout Southern Germany were perplexed by their victory over the Anabaptists. It was not easy to show that their political tenets were revolutionary, and the only subversive portion of their doctrine was that they held, with the Catholics, that the State is not

⁸ "Ich sehe das wohl, dass der Teufel, so er mich bisher nicht hat mögen umbringen durch den Pabst, sucht er mich durch die blutdürstigen Mordpropheten und Rottengeister, so unter euch sind, zu vertilgen und auffressen." Werke, xvi. 77.

⁹ Schenkel, *Wesen des Protestantismus*, iii. 348, 351. Hagen, *Geist der Reformation*, ii. 146, 151. Menzel, *Neuere Geschichte der Deutschen*, i. 115.

¹⁰ See the best of his biographies, Jürgens, *Luther's Leben*, iii. 601.

¹¹ "Quid hoc ad me ? qui sciam etiam Turcam honorandum et ferendum potestatis gratia. Quia certus sum non nisi volente Deo ullam potestatem consistere." De Wette, i. 236.

¹² "I beg first of all that you will not help to mollify Count Albert in these matters, but let him go on as he has begun. . . . Encourage him to go on briskly, to leave things in the hands of God, and obey His divine command to wield the sword as long as he can." "Do not allow yourselves to be much disturbed, for it will redound to the advantage of many souls that will be terrified by it, and preserved." "If there are innocent persons amongst them, God will surely save and preserve them, as He did with Lot and Jeremiah. If He does not, then they are certainly not innocent. . . . We must pray for them, that they obey, otherwise this is no time for compassion ; just let the guns deal with them." "Sentio melius esse omnes rusticos cædi, quam principes et magistratus, eo quod rustici sine autoritate Dei gladium accipiunt. Quam nequitiam Satanæ sequi non potest nisi mera Satanica vastitas regni Dei, et mundi principes etsi excedunt, tamen gladium autoritate Dei gerunt. Ibi utrumque regnum consistere potest, quare nulla misericordia, nulla patientia rusticis debetur, sed ira et indignatio Dei et hominum." De Wette, ii. 653, 655, 666, 669, 671.

responsible for religion.¹³ They were punished, therefore, because they taught that no man ought to suffer for his faith. At Nuremberg the magistrates did not know how to proceed against them. They seemed no worse than the Catholics, whom there was no question at that time of exterminating. The celebrated Osiander deemed these scruples inconsistent. The Papists, he said, ought also to be suppressed; and so long as this was not done, it was impossible to proceed to extremities against the Anabaptists, who were no worse than they. Luther also was consulted; and he decided that they ought not to be punished unless they refused to conform at the command of the government.¹⁴ The Margrave of Brandenburg was also advised by the divines that a heretic who could not be converted out of Scripture might be condemned; but that in his sentence nothing should be said about heresy, but only about sedition and murderous intent, though he should be guiltless of these.¹⁵ With the aid of this artifice great numbers were put to death.

Luther's proud and ardent spirit despised such pretences. He had cast off all reserve, and spoke his mind openly on the rights and duties of the State towards the Church and the people. His first step was to proclaim it the office of the civil power to prevent abominations.¹⁶ He provided no security that, in discharging this duty, the sovereign should be guided by the advice of orthodox divines;¹⁷ but he held the duty itself to be imperative. In obedience to the fundamental principle, that the Bible is the sole guide in all things, he defined the office and justified it by scriptural precedents.

¹³ "Wir lehren die christlich Obrigkeit möge nicht nur, sondern solle auch sich der Religion und Glaubenssachen mit Ernst annehmen; davon halten die Wiedertäufer steif das Widerspiel, welches sie auch zum Theil gemein haben mit den Prälaten der römischen Kirche." Declaration of the Protestants, quoted in Jörg, Deutschland von 1522 bis 1526, p. 709.

¹⁴ "As to your question, how they are to be punished, I do not consider them blasphemers, but regard them in the light of the Turks, or deluded Christians, whom the civil power has not to punish, at least bodily. But if they refuse to acknowledge and to obey the civil authority, then they forfeit all they have and are, for then sedition and murder are certainly in their hearts." De Wette, ii. 622. Osiander's opinion in Jörg, 706.

¹⁵ "Dass in dem Urtheil und desselben öffentlicher Verkündigung keines Irrthums oder Ketzereien . . . sondern allein der Aufruhr und fürgenommenen Morderei, die ihm doch laut seiner Urgicht nie lieb gewesen, gedacht werde." Jörg, 708.

¹⁶ "Principes nostri non cogunt ad fidem et Evangelion, sed cohibent externas abominationes" (De Wette, iii. 50). "Wenn die weltliche Obrigkeit die Verbrechen wider die zweite Gesetzestafel bestrafen, und aus der menschlichen Gesellschaft tilgen solle, wie vielmehr denn die Verbrecher wider die erste?" Luther, apud Bucholtz, Geschichte Ferdinands I., iii. 571.

¹⁷ Planck, iv. 61, explains why this was not thought of.

The Mosaic code, he argued, awarded to false prophets the punishment of death, and the majesty of God is not to be less deeply revered or less rigorously vindicated under the New Testament than under the Old; in a more perfect revelation the obligation is stronger. Those who will not hear the Church must be excluded from the communion; but the civil power is to intervene when the ecclesiastical excommunication has been pronounced, and men must be compelled to come in. For, according to the more accurate definition of the Church which is given in the Confession of Schmalkald, and in the Apology of the Confession of Augsburg, excommunication involves damnation. There is no salvation to be hoped for out of the Church; and the test of orthodoxy against the Pope, the devil, and all the world, is the dogma of justification by faith.¹⁸

The defence of religion became, on this theory, not only the duty of the civil power, but the object of its institution. Its business was solely the coercion of those who were out of the Church. The faithful could not be the objects of its action; they did of their own accord more than any laws required. A good tree, says Luther, brings forth good fruit by nature, without compulsion; is it not madness to prescribe laws to an apple-tree that it shall bear apples and not thorns?¹⁹ This view naturally proceeded from the axiom of the certainty of the salvation of all who believe in the Confession of Augsburg.²⁰ It is the most important element in Luther's political system, because, while it made all Protestant governments despotic, it led to the rejection of the authority of Catholic governments. This is the point where Protestant and Catholic intolerance meet. If the State were instituted to promote the faith, no obedience could be due to a State of a different faith. Protestants could not conscientiously be faithful subjects of Catholic powers, and they could not therefore be tolerated. Misbelievers would have no rights under an orthodox State, and a misbelieving prince would have no authority over orthodox subjects. The more, therefore, Luther expounded the guilt of resistance and the Divine sanction of authority, the more subversive his influence became in Catholic countries. His system was alike revolutionary, whether he defied the Catholic powers or promoted a Protestant tyranny. He had no notion of politi-

¹⁸ Linde, *Staatskirche*, 23. "Der Papst sammt seinem Haufen glaubt nicht; darum bekennen wir, er werde nicht selig, das ist verdammt werden." *Table-Talk*, ii. 350.

¹⁹ Kaltenborn, *Vorläufer des Grotius*, 208.

²⁰ Möhler, *Symbolik*, 428.

cal right. He found no authority for such a claim in the New Testament, and he held that righteousness does not need to exhibit itself in works.

It was the same helpless dependence on the letter of Scripture which led the reformers to consequences more subversive of Christian morality than their views on questions of polity. When Carlstadt cited the Mosaic law in defence of polygamy, Luther was indignant. If the Mosaic law is to govern every thing, he said, we should be compelled to adopt circumcision.²¹ Nevertheless, as there is no prohibition of polygamy in the New Testament, the reformers were unable to condemn it. They did not forbid it as a matter of Divine law, and referred it entirely to the decision of the civil legislator.²² This, accordingly, was the view which guided Luther and Melanchthon in treating the problem, the ultimate solution of which was the separation of England from the Church.²³ When the Landgrave Philip afterwards

²¹ "Quodsi unam legem Mosi cogimur servare, eadem ratione et circumcidemur, et totam legem servare oportebit. . . Nunc vero non sumus amplius sub lege Mosi, sed subjecti legibus civilibus in talibus rebus." Luther to Barnes, 5th Sept. 1531. De Wette, iv. 296.

²² "All things that we find done by the patriarchs in the Old Testament ought to be free and not forbidden. Circumcision is abolished, but not so that it would be a sin to perform it, but optional, neither sinful nor acceptable. . . . In like manner it is not forbidden that a man should have more than one wife. Even at the present day I could not prohibit it; but I would not recommend it" (Commentary on Genesis, 1528; see (Jarche) Studien, 108). "Ego sane fateor, me non posse prohibere, si quis plures velit uxores ducere, nec repugnat sacris literis: verum tamen apud Christianos id exempli nollem primo introduci, apud quos decet etiam ea intermittere, quæ licita sunt, pro vitando scandalo, et pro honestate vitæ" (De Wette, ii. 459. 13th Jan. 1524). "From these instances of bigamy (Lamech, Jacob) no rule can be drawn for our times; and such examples have no power with us Christians, for we live under our authorities, and are subject to our civil laws." Table-Talk, v. 64.

²³ "Antequam tale repudium probarem potius regi permetterem, alteram reginam quoque ducere, et exemplo patrum et regum duas simul uxores seu reginas habere. . . . Si peccavit ducendo uxorem fratris mortui, peccavit in legem humanam seu civilem; si autem repudiaverit, peccabit in legem mere divinam" (De Wette, iv. 296). "Haud dubie rex Angliæ uxorem fratris mortui ductam retinere potest docendus quod has res politicas commiserit Deus magistratibus, neque nos alligaverit ad Moisen. . . . Si vult rex successioni prospicere, quanto satius est, id facere sine infamia prioris conjugii. Ac potest id fieri sine ullo periculo conscientiae cujuscunque aut famæ per polygamiam. Etsi enim non velim concedere polygamiam vulgo, dixi enim supra, nos non ferre leges, tamen in hoc casu propter magnam utilitatem regni, fortassis etiam propter conscientiam regis, ita pronuncio: tutissimum esse regi, si ducat secundam uxorem, priore non abjecta, quia certum est polygamiam non esse prohibitam jure divino, nec res est omnino inusitata" (Melanthonis Opera, ed. Bretschneider, ii. 524, 526). "Nolumus esse auctores divortii, cum conjugium cum jure divino non pugnet. Hi, qui diversum pronunciant, terribiliter exaggerant et exasperant jus divinum. Nos contra exaggeramus in rebus politicis auctoritatem magistratus, quæ profecto non est levis, multaque justa sunt propter magistratus auctoritatem, quæ alioqui in dubium vocantur." Melanchthon to Bucer, Bretschneider, ii. 552.

appealed to this opinion, and to the earlier commentaries of Luther, the reformers were compelled to approve his having two wives. Melancthon was a witness at the wedding of the second, and the only reservation was a request that the matter should not be allowed to get abroad.²⁴ It was the same portion of Luther's theology, and the same opposition to the spirit of the Church in the treatment of Scripture, that induced him to believe in astrology and to ridicule the Copernican system.²⁵

His view of the authority of Scripture and his theory of justification both precluded him from appreciating freedom. Christian freedom, he said, consists in the belief that we require no works to attain piety and salvation.²⁶ Thus he became the inventor of the theory of passive obedience, according to which no motives or provocation can justify a revolt; and the party against whom the revolt is directed, whatever its guilt may be, is to be preferred to the party revolting, however just its cause.²⁷ In 1530 he therefore declared that the German princes had no right to resist the Emperor in defence of their religion. It was the duty of a Christian, he said, to suffer wrong, and no breach of oath or of duty could deprive the Emperor of his right to the unconditional obedience of his subjects.²⁸ Even the empire seemed to him a

²⁴ "Suadere non possumus ut introducatur publice et velut lege sanciat permissio, plures quam unam uxores ducendi. . . . Primum ante omnia cavendum, ne hæc res inducatur in orbem ad modum legis, quam sequendi libera omnibus sit potestas. Deinde considerare dignetur vestra celsitudo scandalum, nimirum quod Evangelio hostes exclamaturi sint, nos similes esse Anabaptistis, qui plures simul duxerunt uxores." De Wette, v. 236. Signed by Luther, Melancthon, and Bucer.

²⁵ "He that would appear wise will not be satisfied with any thing that others do; he must do something for himself, and that must be better than any thing. This fool (Copernicus) wants to overturn the whole science of astronomy. But, as the holy Scriptures tell us, Joshua told the sun to stand still, and not the earth." Table-Talk, iv. 575.

²⁶ "Das ist die christliche Freiheit, der einige Glaube, der da macht, nicht dass wir müßig gehen oder übel thun mögen, sondern dass wir keines Werks bedürfen, die Frömmigkeit und Seligkeit zu erlangen." Sermon von der Freiheit. A Protestant historian, who quotes this passage, goes on to say: "On the other hand, the body must be brought under discipline by every means, in order that it may obey and not burden the inner man. Outward servitude, therefore, assists the progress towards internal freedom." Bensen, Geschichte des Bauernkriegs, 269.

²⁷ Werke, x. 413.

²⁸ "According to Scripture, it is by no means proper that one who would be a Christian should set himself against his superiors, whether by God's permission they act justly or unjustly. But a Christian must suffer violence and wrong, especially from his superiors. . . . As the emperor continues emperor, and princes princes, though they transgress all God's commandments, yea even if they be heathen, so they do even when they do not observe their oath and duty. . . . Sin does not suspend authority and allegiance." De Wette, iii. 560.

despotism, from his scriptural belief that it was a continuation of the last of the four monarchies.²⁹ He preferred submission, in the hope of seeing a future Protestant emperor, to a resistance which might have dismembered the empire if it had succeeded, and in which failure would have been fatal to the Protestants; and he was always afraid to draw the logical consequences of his theory of the duty of Protestants towards Catholic sovereigns. In consequence of this fact, Ranke affirms that the great reformer was also one of the greatest conservatives that ever lived; and his biographer, Jürgens, makes the more discriminating remark that history knows of no man who was at once so great an insurgent and so great an upholder of order as he.³⁰ Neither of these writers understood that the same principle lies at the root both of revolution and of passive obedience, and that the difference is only in the temper of the person who applies it, and in the outward circumstances.

Luther's theory is apparently in opposition to Protestant interests, for it entitles Catholicism to the protection of Catholic powers. He disguised from himself this inconsistency, and reconciled theory with expediency by the calculation that the immense advantages which his system offered to the princes would induce them all to adopt it. For, besides the consolatory doctrine of justification,—“a doctrine original, specious, persuasive, powerful against Rome, and wonderfully adapted, as if prophetically, to the genius of the times which were to follow,”³¹—he bribed the princes with the wealth of the Church, independence of ecclesiastical authority, facilities for polygamy, and absolute power. He told the peasants not to take arms against the Church unless they could persuade the government to give the order; but thinking it probable, in 1522, that the Catholic clergy would, in spite of his advice, be exterminated by the fury of the people, he urged the governments to suppress them, because what was done by the constituted authority could not be wrong.³² Persuaded that the sovereign power would be on his side, he allowed no limits to its extent. It is absurd, he says, to imagine that, even with the best intentions kings can avoid committing occasional injustice; they stand, therefore, particularly in need—not of safeguards against the

²⁹ Ranke, *Reformation*, iii. 183.

³⁰ Ranke, iv. 7; Jürgens, iii. 601.

³¹ Newman, *Lectures on Justification*, 386.

³² “Was durch ordentliche Gewalt geschieht ist nicht für Aufruhr zu halten.” Bensen, 269; (Järcke) *Studien*, 312; Janet, ii. 40.

abuse of power, but—of the forgiveness of sins.³³ The power thus concentrated in the hands of the rulers for the guardianship of the faith, he wished to be used with the utmost severity against unregenerate men, in whom there was neither moral virtue nor civil rights, and from whom no good could come until they were converted. He therefore required that all crimes should be most cruelly punished, and that the secular arm should be employed to convert where it did not destroy. The idea of mercy tempering justice he denounced as a Popish superstition.³⁴

The chief object of the severity thus recommended was of course efficaciously to promote the end for which government itself was held to be instituted. The clergy had authority over the consciences, but it was thought necessary that they should be supported by the State with the obsolete penalties of outlawry, in order that error might be exterminated, although it was impossible to banish sin.³⁵ No government, it was maintained, could tolerate heresy without being responsible for the souls that were seduced by it;³⁶ and as Ezechiel destroyed the brazen serpent to prevent idolatry, the Mass must be suppressed, for the Mass was the worst kind of idolatry.³⁷ In 1530, when it was proposed to leave the matters in dispute to the decision of the future council, Luther declared that the Mass and monastic life could not be tolerated in the mean time, because it was

³³ "Princes, and all rulers and governments, however pious and god-fearing they may be, cannot be without sin in their office and temporal administration. . . . They cannot always be so exactly just and successful as some wiseacres suppose; therefore they are above all in need of the forgiveness of sins." See Kaltenborn, 209.

³⁴ "Of old, under the Papacy, princes and lords, and all judges, were very timid in shedding blood, and punishing robbers, murderers, thieves, and all manner of evil-doers; for they knew not how to distinguish a private individual who is not in office from one in office, charged with the duty of punishing. . . . The executioner had always to do penance, and to apologise beforehand to the convicted criminal for what he was going to do to him, just as if it was sinful and wrong." "Thus they were persuaded by monks to be gracious, indulgent, and peaceable. But authorities, princes, and lords, ought not to be merciful." *Table-Talk*, iv. 159, 160.

³⁵ "Den weltlichen Bann sollten Könige und Kaiser wieder aufrichten, denn wir können ihn jetzt nicht anrichten. . . . Aber so wir nicht können die Sünde des Lebens bannen und strafen, so bannen wir doch die Sünde der Lehre." Bruns, *Luther's Predigten*, 63.

³⁶ "Wo sie solche Rottengeister würden zulassen und leiden, so sie es doch wehren und vorkommen können, würden sie ihre Gewissen gräulich beschweren, und vielleicht nimmermehr widder stillen können, nicht allein der Seelen halben, die dadurch verführt und verdammt werden. . . . sondern auch der ganzen heiligen Kirchen halben." De Wette, iv. 355.

³⁷ "Nu ist alle Abgötterey gegen die Messe ein geringes." De Wette, v. 191. See iv. 307.

unlawful to connive at error.³⁸ "It will lie heavy on your conscience," he writes to the Duke of Saxony, "if you tolerate the Catholic worship; for no secular prince can permit his subjects to be divided by the preaching of opposite doctrines. The Catholics have no right to complain, for they do not prove the truth of their doctrine from Scripture, and therefore do not conscientiously believe it."³⁹ He would tolerate them only if they acknowledged themselves, like the Jews, enemies of Christ and of the Emperor, and consented to exist as outcasts of society.⁴⁰ Heretics, he said, are not to be disputed with, but to be condemned unheard, and whilst they perish by fire, the faithful ought to pursue the evil to its source, and bathe their hands in the blood of the Catholic Bishops, and of the Pope, who is a devil in disguise.⁴¹

The persecuting principles which were involved in Luther's system, but which he cared neither to develop, to apply, nor to defend, were formed into a definite theory by the colder genius of Melancthon. Destitute of Luther's confidence in his own strength, and in the infallible success of his doctrine, he clung more eagerly to the hope of achieving victory by the use of physical force. Like his master, he too hesitated at first, and opposed the use of severe measures against the Zwickau prophets; but when he saw the development of that early germ of dissent, and the gradual dissolution of Lutheran unity, he repented of his ill-timed clemency.⁴² He was not deterred from asserting the duty of persecution by the risk of putting arms into the hands of the enemies of the Reformation. He acknowledged the danger, but he denied the right. Catholic powers, he deemed, might justly persecute, but they could only persecute error. They must apply the same criterions which the Lutherans applied, and then they were justified in persecuting those

³⁸ Bucholtz, iii. 570.

³⁹ "Sie aber verachten die Schrift muthwilliglich, darum wären sie billig aus der einigen Ursach zu stillen, oder nicht zu leiden." De Wette, iii. 90.

⁴⁰ "Wollen sie aber wie die Juden seyn, nicht Christen heissen, noch Kaisers Glieder, sondern sich lassen Christus und Kaisers Feinde nennen, wie die Juden; wohlan, so wollen wirs auch leiden, dass sie in ihren Synagogen, wie die Juden, verschlossen lästern, so lang sie wollen." De Wette, iv. 94.

⁴¹ Riffel, Kirchengeschichte, ii. 9. Table-Talk, iii. 175.

⁴² "Ego ab initio, cum primum cœpi nosse Ciconiam et Ciconiæ factionem, unde hoc totum genus Anabaptistarum exortum est, fui stulte clemens. Sentiebant enim et alii hæreticos non esse ferro opprimendos. Et tunc dux Fridericus vehementer iratus erat Ciconiæ: ac nisi a nobis tectus esset, fuisset de homine furioso et perditæ malo sumtum supplicium. Nunc me ejus clementiæ non parum pœnitet. . . . Brentius nimis clemens est." Bretschneider, ii. 17. Feb. 1530.

whom the Lutherans also proscribed. For the civil power had no right to proscribe a religion in order to save itself from the dangers of a distracted and divided population. The judge of the fact and of the danger must be, not the magistrate, but the clergy.⁴³ The crime lay, not in dissent, but in error. Here, therefore, Melanchthon repudiated the theory and practice of the Catholics, whose aid he invoked; for all intolerance in the Catholic times was founded on the combination of two ideas,—the criminality of apostasy, and the inability of the State to maintain its authority where the moral sense of a part of the community was in opposition to it. The reformers, therefore, approved the Catholic practice of intolerance, and even encouraged it, although their own principles of persecution were destitute not only of connexion, but even of analogy, with it. By simply accepting the inheritance of the medieval theory of the religious unity of the empire, they would have been its victims. By asserting that persecution was justifiable only against error, that is, only when purely religious, they set up a shield for themselves, and a sword against those sects for whose destruction they were more eager than the Catholics. Whether we refer the origin of Protestant intolerance to the doctrines or to the interests of the Reformation, it appears totally unconnected with the tradition of Catholic ages, or the atmosphere of Catholicism. All severities exercised by Catholics before that time had a practical motive; but Protestant persecution was based on a purely speculative foundation, and was due partly to the influence of Scripture examples, partly to the supposed interests of the Protestant party. It never admitted the exclusion of dissent to be a political right of the State, but maintained the suppression of error to be its political duty. To say, therefore, that the Protestants learnt persecution from the Catholics, is as false as to say that they used it by way of revenge. For they founded it on very different and contradictory grounds, and they admitted the right of the Catholics to persecute even the Protestant sects.

Melanchthon taught that the sects ought to be put down by the sword, and that any individual who started new

⁴³ "Sed obijciunt exemplum nobis periculosum: si hæc pertinent ad magistratus, quoties igitur magistratus judicabit aliquos errare, sæviet in eos. Cæsar igitur debet nos opprimere, quoniam ita judicat nos errare. Respondeo: certe debet errores et prohibere et punire. . . . Non est enim solius Cæsaris cognitio, sicut in urbibus hæc cognitio non est tantum magistratus prophani, sed est doctorum. Viderit igitur magistratus ut recte judicet" (Bretschneider, ii. 712). "Deliberent igitur principes, non cum tyrannis, non cum pontificibus, non cum hypocritis, monachis aut aliis, sed cum ipsa Evangelii voce, cum probatis scriptoribus." Bretschneider, iii. 254.

opinions ought to be punished with death.⁴⁴ He carefully laid down that these severities were requisite, not in consideration of the danger to the State, nor of immoral teaching, nor even of such differences as would weaken the authority or arrest the action of the ecclesiastical organisation, but simply on account of a difference, however slight, in the theologoumena of Protestantism.⁴⁵ Thamer, who held the possibility of salvation among the heathen; Schwenkfeld, who taught that not the written Word, but the internal illumination of grace in the soul, was the channel of God's influence on man; the Zwinglians, with their error on the Eucharist,—all these met with no more favour than the fanatical Anabaptists.⁴⁶ The State was held bound to vindicate the first table of the law with the same severity as those commandments on which civil society depends for its existence. The government of

⁴⁴ "Quare ita sentias, magistratum debere uti summa severitate in coercendis hujusmodi spiritibus. . . . Sines igitur novis exemplis timorem incuti multitudini . . . ad hæc notæ tibi sint causæ seditionum, quas gladio prohiberi oportet. . . . Propterea sentio de his qui etiamsi non defendunt seditiosos articulos, habent manifeste blasphemos, quod interfici a magistratu debeant" (ii. 17, 18). "De Anabaptistis tulimus hic in genere sententiam: quia constat sectam diabolicam esse, non esse tolerandam: dissipari enim ecclesias per eos, cum ipsi nullam habeant certam doctrinam. . . . Ideo in capita factionum in singulis locis ultima supplicia constituenda esse judicavimus" (ii. 549). "It is clear that it is the duty of secular government to punish blasphemy, false doctrine, and heresy, on the bodies of those who are guilty of them. . . . Since it is evident that there are gross errors in the articles of the Anabaptist sect, we conclude that in this case the obstinate ought to be punished with death" (iii. 199). "Propter hanc causam Deus ordinavit politias ut Evangelium propagari possit . . . nec revocamus politiam Moysi, sed lex moralis perpetua est omnium ætatum . . . quandocumque constat doctrinam esse impiam, nihil dubium est quin sanior pars Ecclesiæ debeat malos pastores remove et abolere impios cultus. Et hanc emendationem præcipue adjuvare debent magistratus, tanquam potiora membra Ecclesiæ" (iii. 242, 244). "Thammerus, qui Mahometicas seu Ethnicas opiniones spargit, vagatur in diocesi Mindensi, quem publicis suppliciis adficere debebant. . . . Evomuit blasphemias, quæ refutandæ sunt non tantum disputatione aut scriptis, sed etiam justo officio pii magistratus" (ix. 125, 131).

⁴⁵ "Voco autem blasphemos qui articulos habent, qui proprie non pertinent ad civilem statum, sed continent *θεωρίας* ut de divinitate Christi et similes. Etsi enim gradus quidam sunt, tamen huc etiam refero baptismum infantum. . . . Quia magistratui commissæ est tutela totius legis, quod attinet ad externam disciplinam et externa facta. Quare delicta externa contra primam tabulam prohibere ac punire debet. . . . Quare non solum concessum est, sed etiam mandatum est magistratui, impias doctrinas abolere, et tueri pias in suis ditionibus" (ii. 711). "Ecclesiastica potestas tantum judicat et excommunicat hæreticos, non occidit. Sed potestas civilis debet constituere pœnas et supplicia in hæreticos, sicut in blasphemos constituit supplicia. . . . Non enim plectitur fides, sed hæresis" (xii. 697).

⁴⁶ "Notum est etiam, quosdam tetra et *δύσφημα* dixisse de sanguine Christi, quos puniri oportuit, et propter gloriam Christi, et exempli causa" (viii. 553). "Argumentatur ille præstigiator (Schwenkfeld), verbum externum non esse medium, quo Deus est efficax. Talis sophistica principum severitate compescenda erat" (ix. 579).

the Church being administered by the civil magistrates, it was their office also to enforce the ordinances of religion; and the same power whose voice proclaimed religious orthodoxy and law, held in its hand the sword by which they were enforced. No religious authority existed except through the civil power.⁴⁷ The Church was merged in the State; but the laws of the State, in return, were identified with the commandments of religion.⁴⁸

In accordance with these principles, the condemnation of Servetus by a civil tribunal, which had no authority over him, and no jurisdiction over his crime,—the most aggressive and revolutionary act, therefore, that is conceivable in the casuistry of persecution,—was highly approved by Melanchthon. He declared it a most useful example for all future ages, and could not understand that there should be any who did not regard it in the same favourable light.⁴⁹ It is true that Servetus, by denying the divinity of Christ, was open to the charge of blasphemy in a stricter sense than that in which the reformers generally applied it. But this was not the case with the Catholics. They did not represent, like the sects, an element of dissolution in Protestantism, and the bulk of their doctrine was admitted by the reformers. They were not in revolt against existing authority; they required no special innovations for their protection; they demanded only that the change of religion should not be compulsory. Yet Melanchthon held that they too were to be proscribed, because

⁴⁷ "The office of preacher is distinct from that of governor, yet both have to contribute to the praise of God. Princes are not only to protect the goods and bodily life of their subjects, but the principal function is to promote the honour of God, and to prevent idolatry and blasphemy" (iii. 199). "Errant igitur magistratus, qui divellunt gubernationem a fine, et se tantum pacis ac ventris custodes esse exsistunt. . . . At si tantum venter curandus esset, quid differrent principes ab armentariis? Nam longe aliter sentiendum est. Politias divinitus admirabili sapientia et bonitate constitutas esse, non tantum ad quærenda et fruenda ventris bona, sed multo magis, ut Deus in societate innotescat, ut æterna bona quærantur" (iii. 246).

⁴⁸ "Neque illa barbarica excusatio audienda est, leges illas pertinere ad politiam Mosaicam, non ad nostram. Ut Decalogus ipse ad omnes pertinet, ita iudex ubique omnia Decalogi officia in externa disciplina tueatur" (viii. 520).

⁴⁹ "Legi scriptum tuum, in quo refutasti luculenter horrendas Serveti blasphemias, ac filio Dei gratias ago, qui fuit *βραβεύτης* hujus tui agonis. Tibi quoque Ecclesia et nunc et ad posteros gratitudinem debet et debebit. Tuo iudicio prorsus adsentior. Affirmo etiam, vestros magistratus juste fecisse, quod hominem blasphemum, re ordine judicata, interfecerunt" (Melanchthon to Calvin. Bretschneider, viii. 362). "Judico etiam Senatum Genevensem recte fecisse, quod hominem pertinacem et non omissurum blasphemias sustulit. Ac miratus sum, esse, qui severitatem illam improbant" (viii. 523). "Dedit vero et Genevensis reip. magistratus ante annos quatuor punitæ insanabilis blasphemiae adversus filium Dei, sublato Serveto Arragone pium et memorabile ad omnem posteritatem exemplum" (ix. 133).

their worship was idolatrous.⁵⁰ In doing this, he adopted the principle of aggressive intolerance, which was at that time new to the Christian world, and which the Popes and councils of the Catholic Church had condemned when the zeal of laymen had gone beyond the lawful measure. In the middle ages there had been persecution far more sanguinary than any that has been inflicted by Protestants. Various motives had occasioned it, and various arguments had been used in its defence. But the principle on which the Protestants oppressed the Catholics was new. The Catholics had never admitted the theory of absolute toleration, as it was defined at first by Luther, and afterwards by some of the sects. In principle, their tolerance differed from that of the Protestants as widely as their intolerance. They had exterminated sects which, like the Albigenses, threatened to overturn the fabric of Christian society. They had proscribed different religions where the State was founded on religious unity, and where this unity formed an integral part of its laws and administration. They had gone one step further, and punished those whom the Church condemned as apostates; thereby vindicating, not, as in the first case, the moral basis of society, nor, as in the second, the religious foundation of the State; but the authority of the Church, and the purity of her doctrine, on which they relied as the pillar and bulwark of the social and political order. Where a portion of the inhabitants of any country preferred a different creed, Jew, Mahomedan, heathen, or schismatic, they had been generally tolerated, with enjoyment of property and personal freedom, but not with that of political power or autonomy. But political freedom had been denied them because they did not admit the common ideas of duty which were its basis. This position, however, was not tenable, and was the source of great disorders. The Protestants, in like manner, could give reasons for several kinds of persecution. They could bring the Socinians under the category of blasphemers; and blasphemy, like the ridicule of sacred things, destroys reverence and awe, and tends to the destruction of society. The Anabaptists, they might argue, were revolutionary fanatics, whose doctrines were subversive of the civil order; and the dogmatic sects threatened the ruin of ecclesiastical unity within the Protestant community itself. But by placing the neces-

⁵⁰ "Abusus missæ per magistratus debet tolli. Non aliter, atque sustulit æneum serpentem Ezechias, aut excelsa demolitus est Josias" (i. 480). "Politiciis magistratibus severissime mandatum est, ut suo quisque loco manibus et armis tollant statuas, ad quas fiunt hominum concursus et invocationes, et puniant suppliciiis corporum insanabiles, qui idolorum cultum pertinaciter retinent, aut blasphemias serunt" (ix. 77).

sity of intolerance on the simple ground of religious error, and in directing it against the Church which they themselves had abandoned, they introduced a purely subjective test, and a purely revolutionary system. It is on this account that the *tu quoque*, or retaliatory argument, is inadmissible between Catholics and Protestants. Catholic intolerance is handed down from an age when unity subsisted, and when its preservation, being essential for that of society, became a necessity of State as well as a result of circumstances. Protestant intolerance, on the contrary, was the peculiar fruit of a dogmatic system, in contradiction with the facts and principles on which the intolerance actually existing among Catholics was founded. Spanish intolerance has been infinitely more sanguinary than Swedish; but in Spain, independently of the interests of religion, there were strong political and social reasons to justify persecution without seeking any theory to prop it up; whilst in Sweden all those practical considerations have either been wanting, or have been opposed to persecution, which has consequently had no justification except the theory of the Reformation. The only instance in which the Protestant theory has been adopted by Catholics is the revocation of the Edict of Nantes.

Towards the end of his life, Melanchthon having ceased to be a strict Lutheran, receded somewhat from his former uncompromising position, and was adverse to a strict scrutiny into minor theological differences. He drew a distinction between errors that required punishment and variations that were not of practical importance.⁵¹ The English Calvinists who took refuge in Germany in the reign of Mary Tudor were ungraciously received by those who were stricter Lutherans than Melanchthon. He was consulted concerning the course to be adopted towards the refugees, and he recommended toleration. But both at Wesel and at Frankfort his advice was, to his great disgust, overruled.⁵²

⁵¹ "If the French and English community at Frankfort shared the errors of Servetus or Thamer, or other enemies of the Symbols, or the errors of the Anabaptists on infant baptism, against the authority of the state, &c., I should faithfully advise and strongly recommend that they should be soon driven away; for the civil power is bound to prevent and to punish proved blasphemy and sedition. But I find that this community is orthodox in the symbolical articles on the Son of God, and in other articles of the Symbol. . . . If the faith of the citizens in every town were inquired into, what trouble and confusion would not arise in many countries and towns!" (ix. 179.)

⁵² Schmidt, Philipp Melanchthon, 640. His exhortations to the Landgrave to put down the Zwinglians are characteristic: "The Zwinglians, without waiting for the council, persecute the Papists and the Anabaptists; why must it be wrong for others to prohibit their indefensible doctrine independent of the council?" Philip replied: "Forcibly to prohibit a doctrine

The severities of the Protestants were chiefly provoked by the Anabaptists, who denied the lawfulness of civil government, and strove to realise the kingdom of God on earth by absorbing the State in the Church.⁵³ None protested more loudly than they against the Lutheran intolerance, or suffered from it more severely. But while denying the spiritual authority of the State, they claimed for their religious community a still more absolute right of punishing error by death. Though they sacrificed government to religion, the effect was the same as that of absorbing the Church in the State. In 1524, Munzer published a sermon, in which he besought the Lutheran princes to extirpate Catholicism. "Have no remorse," he says; "for He to whom all power is given in heaven and on earth means to govern alone."⁵⁴ He demanded the punishment of all heretics, the destruction of all who were not of his faith, and the institution of religious unity. "Do not pretend," he says, "that the power of God will accomplish it without the use of your sword, or it will grow rusty in the scabbard. The tree that bringeth not forth good fruit must be cut down and cast into the fire." And elsewhere, "The ungodly have no right to live, except so far as the elect choose to grant it them."⁵⁵ When the Anabaptists were supreme at Munster, they exhibited the same intolerance. At seven in the morning of Friday, 27th February 1534, they ran through the streets crying, "Away with the ungodly! God will awake and chastise you!" Breaking into the houses of those who refused their baptism, they drove the men out of the town, and forcibly rebaptised the women who remained behind.⁵⁶

which neither contradicts the articles of faith nor encourages sedition, I do not think right. . . . When Luther began to write and to preach, he admonished and instructed the government that it had no right to forbid books, or to prevent preaching, and that its office did not extend so far, but that it had only to govern the body and goods. . . . I had not heard before that the Zwinglians persecute the Papists; but if they abolish abuses, it is not unjust, for the Papists wish to deserve heaven by their works, and so blaspheme the Son of God. That they should persecute the Anabaptists is also not wrong, for their doctrine is in part seditious." The divines answered: "If by God's grace our true and necessary doctrine is tolerated as it has hitherto been by the emperor, though reluctantly, we think that we ought not to prevent it by undertaking the defence of the Zwinglian doctrine, if that should not be tolerated. . . . As to the argument that we ought to spare the people while persecuting the leaders, our answer is, that it is not a question of persons, but only of doctrine, whether it be true or false." Correspondence of Brenz and Melancthon with Landgrave Philip of Hesse. Bretschneider, ii. 95, 98, 101.

⁵³ Hardwicke, Reformation, 274.

⁵⁴ Seidemann, Thomas Münzer, 35.

⁵⁵ Schenkel, iii. 381.

⁵⁶ Heinrich Grosbeck's Bericht, ed. Cornelius, 19.

Whilst, therefore, the Anabaptists were punished for questioning the authority of the Lutherans in religious matters, they practically justified their persecution by their own intolerant doctrines. In fact, they carried the Protestant principles of persecution to an extreme. For whereas the Lutherans regarded the defence of truth and punishment of error as being, in part, the object of the institution of civil government, they recognised it as an advantage by which the State was rewarded for its pains ; but the Anabaptists repudiated the political element altogether, and held that error should be exterminated solely for the sake of truth, and at the expense of all existing States.

Bucer, whose position in the history of the Reformation is so peculiar, and who differed in important points from the Saxon leaders, agreed with them on the necessity of persecuting. He was so anxious for the success of Protestantism, that he was ready to sacrifice and renounce important doctrines, in order to save the appearance of unity ;⁵⁷ but those opinions in which he took so little dogmatic interest, he was resolved to defend by force. He was very much dissatisfied with the reluctance of the Senate of Strasburg to adopt severe measures against the Catholics. His colleague Capito was singularly tolerant ; for the feeling of the inhabitants was not decidedly in favour of the change.⁵⁸ But Bucer, his biographer tells us, was, in spite of his inclination to mediate, not friendly to this temporising system ; partly because he had an organising intellect, which relied greatly on practical discipline to preserve what had been conquered, and on restriction of liberty to be the most certain security for its preservation ; partly because he had a deep insight into the nature of various religious tendencies, and was justly alarmed at their consequences for Church and State.⁵⁹ This point in the character of Bucer provoked a powerful resistance to his system of ecclesiastical discipline ; for it was feared that he would give to the clergy a tyrannical power.⁶⁰ It is true that the demoralisation which ensued on the destruction of the old ecclesiastical authority rendered a strict attention on the part of the State to the affairs of religion highly necessary.⁶¹ The pri-

⁵⁷ Herzog, *Encyclopädie für Protestantische Theologie*, ii. 418.

⁵⁸ Bussierre, *Etablissement du Protestantisme en Alsace*, 429.

⁵⁹ Baum, *Capito und Butzer*, 489.

⁶⁰ Baum, 492. Erbkam, *Protestantische Sekten*, 581.

⁶¹ Ursinus writes to Bullinger: "*Liberavit nos Deus ab idolatria: succedit licentia infinita et horribilis divini nominis, ecclesiæ doctrinæ purioris et sacra-*

vate and confidential communications of the German reformers give a more hideous picture of the moral condition of the generation which followed the Reformation than they draw in their published writings of that which preceded it. It is on this account that Bucer so strongly insisted on the necessity of the interference of the civil power in support of the discipline of the Church.

The Swiss reformers, between whom and the Saxons Bucer forms a connecting link, differ from them in one respect, which greatly influenced their notions of government. Luther lived under a monarchy which was almost absolute, and in which the common people, who were of Slavonic origin, were in the position of the most abject servitude; but the divines of Zurich and Bern were republicans. They did not therefore entertain his exalted views as to the irresistible might of the State; and instead of requiring as absolute a theory of the indefectibility of the civil power as he did, they were satisfied with obtaining a preponderating influence for themselves. Where the power was in hands less favourable to their cause, they had less inducement to exaggerate its rights.

Zwingli abolishes both the distinction between Church and State, and the notion of ecclesiastical authority. In his system, the civil rulers possess the spiritual functions; and, as their foremost duty is the preservation and promotion of the true religion, it is their business to preach. As magistrates are too much occupied with other things, they must delegate the ministry of the word to preachers, for whose orthodoxy they have to provide. They are bound to establish uniformity of doctrine, and to defend it against papists and heretics. This is not only their right, but their duty; and not only their duty, but the condition on which they retain office.⁶² Rulers who do not act in accordance with it are to be dismissed. Thus Zwingli combined persecution and revolution in the same doctrine. But he was not a fanatical persecutor; and his severity was directed less against the Catholics than against the Anabaptists,⁶³ whose prohibition of all civil offices was more subversive of order in a

mentorum prophanatio et sub pedibus porcorum et canum, conniventibus atque utinam non defendentibus iis qui prohibere suo loco debebant, conculcatio." Sudhoff, Olevianus und Ursinus, 340.

⁶² "Adserere audemus, neminem magistratum recte gerere ne posse quidem, nisi Christianus sit" (Zuingli Opera, iii. 296). "If they shall proceed in an unbrotherly way, and against the ordinance of Christ, then let them be deposed, in God's name." Schenkel, iii. 362.

⁶³ Christoffel, Huldreich Zwingli, 251.

republic than in a monarchy. Even, however, in the case of the Anabaptists, the special provocation was—not the peril to the State, nor the scandal of their errors, but—the schism which weakened the Church.⁶⁴ The punishment of heresy for the glory of God was almost inconsistent with the theory that there is no ecclesiastical power. It was not so much provoked in Zurich as elsewhere, because in a small republican community, where the governing body was supreme over both civil and religious affairs, religious unity was a matter of course. The practical necessity of maintaining unity put out of sight the speculative question of the guilt and penalty of error.

Soon after Zwingli's death, Leo Judæ called for severer measures against the Catholics, expressly stating, however, that they did not deserve death. Excommunication, he said, was too light a punishment to be inflicted by the State, which wields the sword, and the faults in question were not great enough to involve the danger of death.⁶⁵ Afterwards he fell into doubts as to the propriety of severe measures against dissenters; but his friends Bullinger and Capito succeeded in removing his scruples, and in obtaining his acquiescence in that intolerance, which was, says his biographer, a question of life and death for the Protestant Church.⁶⁶ Bullinger took, like Zwingli, a more practical view of the question than was common in Germany. He thought it safer strictly to exclude religious differences than to put them down with fire and sword; for in this case, he says, the victims compare themselves to the early martyrs, and make their punishment a weapon of defence.⁶⁷ He did not, however, forbid capital punishment in cases of heresy. In the year 1535 he drew up an opinion on the treatment of religious error, which is written in a tone of great moderation. In this document he says that all sects which introduce division into the Church must be put down, and not only such as, like the Anabaptists, threaten to subvert society; for the destruction of order and unity often begins in an apparently harmless or imperceptible way. The culprit should be examined with gentleness. If his disposition is good, he will not refuse in-

⁶⁴ Zwingli's advice to the Protestants of St. Gall, in Pressel, Joachim Vadian, 45.

⁶⁵ Pestalozzi, Heinrich Bullinger, 95.

⁶⁶ Id., Leo Judä, 50.

⁶⁷ Id., Bullinger, 146.

struction ; if not, still patience must be shown until there is no hope of converting him. Then he must be treated like other malefactors, and handed over to the torturer and the executioner.⁶⁸ After this time there were no executions for religion in Zurich, and the number, even in the lifetime of Zwingli, was less considerable than in many other places. But it was still understood that confirmed heretics would be put to death. In 1546, in answer to the Pope's invitation to the Council of Trent, Bullinger indignantly repudiates the insinuation that the Protestant cantons were heretical ; "for, by the grace of God, we have always punished the vices of heresy and sodomy with fire, and have looked upon them, and still look upon them, with horror."⁶⁹ This accusation of heresy inflamed the zeal of the reformers against heretics, in order to prove to the Catholics that they had no sympathy with them. On these grounds Bullinger recommended the execution of Servetus. "If the high council inflicts on him the fate due to a worthless blasphemer, all the world will see that the people of Geneva hate blasphemers, and that they punish with the sword of justice heretics who are obstinate in their heresy. . . . Strict fidelity and vigilance are needed, because our churches are in ill-repute abroad, as if we were heretics and friends of heresy. Now God's holy providence has furnished an opportunity of clearing ourselves of this evil suspicion."⁷⁰ After the event, he advised Calvin to justify it, as there were some who were taken aback. "Every where," he says, "there are excellent men who are convinced that godless and blaspheming men ought not only to be rebuked and imprisoned, but also to be put to death. . . . How Servetus could have been spared, I cannot see."⁷¹

The position of Ecolampadius in reference to these questions was altogether singular and exceptional. He dreaded the absorption of the ecclesiastical functions by the State, and sought to avoid it by the introduction of a council of twelve elders, partly magistrates, partly clergy, to direct ecclesiastical affairs. Many things, he said, are

⁶⁸ 149.⁶⁹ 270.⁷⁰ 426.

⁷¹ 428. In the year 1555 he writes to Socinus: "I too am of opinion that heretical men must be cut off with the spiritual sword. . . . The Lutherans at first did not understand that sectaries must be restrained and punished, but after the fall of Munster, when thousands of poor misguided men, many of them orthodox, had perished, they were compelled to admit that it is wiser and better for the government not only to restrain wrong-headed men, but also, by putting to death a few that deserve it, to protect thousands of inhabitants." *Ibid.*

punished by the secular power less severely than the dignity of the Church demands. On the other hand, it punishes the repentant, to whom the Church shows mercy. Either it blunts the edge of its sword by not punishing the guilty, or it brings some hatred on the Gospel by severity.⁷² But the people of Basil were deaf to the arguments of the reformer, and here, as elsewhere, the civil power usurped the office of the Church. In harmony with this jealousy of political interference, Œcolampadius was very merciful to the Anabaptists. Severe penalties, he said, were likely to aggravate the evil; forgiveness would hasten the cure.⁷³ A few months later, however, he regretted this leniency. "We perceive," he writes to a friend, "that we have sometimes shown too much indulgence; but this is better than to proceed tyrannically, or to surrender the keys of the Church."⁷⁴ Whilst, on the other hand, he rejoiced at the expulsion of the Catholics, he ingeniously justified the practice of the Catholic persecutors. "In the early ages of the Church, when the divinity of Christ manifested itself to the world by miracles, God incited the Apostles to treat the ungodly with severity. When the miracles ceased, and the faith was universally adopted, He gained the hearts of princes and rulers, so that they undertook to protect with the sword the gentleness and patience of the Church. They rigorously resisted, in fulfilment of the duties of their office, the contemners of the Church."⁷⁵ The clergy, he goes on to say, became tyrannical because they usurped to themselves a power which they ought to have shared with others; and as the people dread the return of this tyranny of ecclesiastical authority, it is wiser for the Protestant clergy to make no use of the similar power of excommunication which is intrusted to them.

Calvin, as the subject of an absolute monarch, and the ruling spirit in a republic, differed both from the German and the Swiss reformers in his idea of the State both in its object and in its duty towards the Church. An exile from his own country, he had lost the associations and habits of monarchy, and his views of discipline as well as doctrine were matured before he took up his abode in Swit-

⁷² Herzog, *Leben Œkolampads*, ii. 197.

⁷³ 189.

⁷⁴ 206.

⁷⁵ 195. Herzog finds an excuse for the harsh treatment of the Lutherans at Basil in the still greater severity of the Lutheran Churches against the followers of the Swiss reformation, 213.

zerland.⁷⁶ His system was not founded on existing facts; it had no roots in history, but was purely ideal, speculative, and therefore more consistent and inflexible than any other. Luther's political ideas were bounded by the horizon of the monarchical absolutism under which he lived. Zwingli's were influenced by the democratic forms of his native country, which gave to the whole community the right of appointing the governing body. Calvin, independent of all such considerations, studied only how his doctrine could best be realised, whether through the instrumentality of existing authorities, or at their expense. In his eyes its interests were paramount, their promotion the supreme duty, opposition to them an unpardonable crime. There was nothing in the institutions of men, no authority, no right, no liberty, that he cared to preserve, or towards which he entertained any feelings of reverence or obligation.

His theory made the support of religious truth the end and office of the State,⁷⁷ which was bound therefore to protect, and consequently to obey, the Church, and had no control over it. In religion the first and highest thing was the dogma: the preservation of morals was one important office of government; but the maintenance of the purity of doctrine was the highest. The result of this theory is the institution of a pure theocracy. If the elect were alone upon the earth, Calvin taught, there would be no need of the political order, and the Anabaptists would be right in rejecting it;⁷⁸ but the elect are in a minority; and there is the mass of reprobates who must be coerced by the sword, in order

⁷⁶ Hundeshagen, *Conflikte des Zwinglianismus und Calvinismus*, 41.

⁷⁷ "Huc spectat (politia) . . . ne idololatria, ne in Dei nomen sacrilegia, ne adversus ejus veritatem blasphemiae aliaeque religionis offensiones publice emergant ac in populum spargantur. . . . Politicam ordinationem probo, quae in hoc incumbit, ne vera religio, quae Dei lege continetur, palam, publicisque sacrilegiis impune violetur" (*Institutio Christianae Religionis*, ed. Tholuck, ii. 477). "Hoc ergo summopere requiritur a regibus, ut gladio quo praediti sunt utantur ad cultum Dei asserendum." *Prælectiones in Prophetas*,—*Opera*, v. 223, ed. 1667.

⁷⁸ "Huic etiam colligere promptum est, quam stulta fuerit imaginatio eorum qui volebant usum gladii tollere e mundo, Evangelii prætextu. Scimus Anabaptistas fuisse tumultuatos, quasi totus ordo politicus repugnaret Christi regno, quia regnum Christi continetur sola doctrina; deinde nulla futura sit vis. Hoc quidem verum esset, si essemus in hoc mundo angeli: sed quemadmodum jam dixi, exiguus est piorum numerus: ideo necesse est reliquam turbam cohiberi violento freno: quia permixti sunt filii Dei vel sævis belluis, vel vulpibus et fraudulentis hominibus" (*Pr. in Michæam*, v. 310). "In quo non suam modo inscitiam, sed diabolicum fastum produnt, dum perfectionem sibi arrogant, cujus ne centesima quidem pars in illis conspicitur." *Institutio*, ii. 478.

that all the world may be made subject to the truth, by the conquerors imposing their faith upon the vanquished.⁷⁹ He wished to extend religion by the sword, but to reserve death as the punishment of apostasy; and as this law would include the Catholics, who were in Calvin's eyes apostates from the truth, he narrowed it further to those who were apostates from the community. In this way, he said, there was no pretext given to the Catholics to retaliate.⁸⁰ They, as well as the Jews and Mohammedans, must be allowed to live: death was only the penalty of Protestants who relapsed into error; but to them it applied equally whether they were converted to the Church or joined the sects and fell into unbelief. Only in cases where there was no danger of his words being used against the Protestants, and in letters not intended for publication, he required that Catholics should suffer the same penalties as those who were guilty of sedition, on the ground that the majesty of God must be as strictly avenged as the throne of the king.⁸¹

If the defence of the truth was the purpose for which power was intrusted to princes, it was natural that it should be also the condition on which they held it. Long before the revolution of 1688, Calvin had decided that princes who deny the true faith, "abdicate" their crowns, and are no longer to be obeyed;⁸² and that no oaths are binding which are in contradiction to the interests of Protestantism.⁸³ He painted

⁷⁹ "Tota igitur excellentia, tota dignitas, tota potentia Ecclesiæ debet huc referri, ut omnia subjaceant Deo, et quicquid erit in gentibus hoc totum sit sacrum, ut scilicet cultus Dei tam apud victores quam apud victos vigeat." Pr. in Michæam, v. 317.

⁸⁰ "Ita tollitur offensio, quæ multos imperitos fallit, dum metuunt ne hoc prætextu ad sæviendum armentur Papæ carnifices." Calvin was warned by experience of the imprudence of Luther's language. "In Gallis procures in excusanda sævitia immani, allegant auctoritatem Lutheri." Melancthon, Opera, v. 176.

⁸¹ "Vous avez deux espèces de mutins qui se sont eslevez entre le roy et l'estat du royaume: Les uns sont gens fantastiques, qui sous couleur de l'évangile voudroient mettre tout en confusion. Les autres sont gens obstinés aux superstitions de l'Antéchrist de Rome. Tous ensemble méritent bien d'estre réprimés par le glayve qui vous est commis, veu qu'ils s'attaschent non-seulement au roy, mais à Dieu qui l'a assis au siège royal." Calvin to Somerset, 22d October 1548,—Lettres de Calvin, ed. Bonnet, i. 267. See also Henry, Leben Calvins, ii. append. 30.

⁸² "Abdicant enim se potestate terreni principes dum insurgunt contra Deum: imo indigni sunt qui censeantur in hominum numero. Potius ergo conspuere oportet in ipsorum capita, quam illis parere, ubi ita proterviunt ut velint etiam spoliare Deum jure suo, et quasi occupare solium ejus, acsi possent eum a cœlo detrahare." Pr. in Daniele, v. 91.

⁸³ "Quant au serment qu'on vous a contraincte de faire, comme vous avez failli et offensé Dieu en le faisant, aussi n'estes-vous tenue de le garder." Cal-

the princes of his age in the blackest colours,⁸⁴ and prayed to God for their destruction ;⁸⁵ though at the same time he condemned all rebellion on the part of his friends, so long as there were great doubts of their success.^{85a} His principles, however, were often stronger than his exhortations, and he had difficulty in preventing murders and seditious movements in France.⁸⁶ When he was dead, nobody prevented them, and it became clear that his system, by subjecting the civil power to the service of religion, was more dangerous to toleration than Luther's plan of giving to the State supremacy over the Church.

Calvin was as positive as Luther in asserting the duty of obedience to rulers irrespective of their mode of government.⁸⁷ He constantly declared that tyranny was not to be

vin to the Duchess of Ferrara,—Bonnet, ii. 338. She had taken an oath, at her husband's death, that she would not correspond with Calvin.

⁸⁴ "In aulis regum videmus primas teneri a bestiis. Nam hodie, ne repetamus veteres historias, ut reges fere omnes fatui sunt ac bruti, ita etiam sunt quasi equi et asini brutorum animalium. . . . Reges sunt hodie fere mancipia" (Pr. in Daniele, v. 82). "Videmus enim ut hodie quoque pro sua libidine commoveant totum orbem principes: quia produnt alii aliis innoxios populos, et exercent fœdam nundinationem, dum quisque commodum suum venatur, et sine ullo pudore, tantum ut augeat suam potentiam, alios tradit in manum inimici" (Pr. in Nahum, v. 363). "Hodie pudet reges aliquid præ se ferre humanum, sed omnes gestus accommodant ad tyrannidem." Pr. in Jeremiam, v. 257.

⁸⁵ "Sur ce que je vous avais allégué, que David nous instruit par son exemple de haïr les ennemis de Dieu, vous respondes que c'estoit pour ce temps-là duquel sous la loi de rigueur il estoit permis de haïr les ennemis. Or, madame, ceste glose seroit pour renverser toute l'Ecriture, et partant il la fault fuir comme une peste mortelle. . . . Combien que j'aye tousjours prié Dieu de luy faire mercy, si est-ce que j'ay souvent désiré que Dieu mist la main sur luy (Guise) pour en deslivrer son Eglise, s'il ne le vouloit convertir." Calvin to the Duchess of Ferrara,—Bonnet, ii. 551. Luther was in this respect equally unscrupulous: "This year we must pray Duke Maurice to death, we must kill him with our prayer; for he will be an evil man." Ms. quoted in Döllinger, Reformation, iii. 266.

^{85a} "Quod de præpostero nostrorum fervore scribis, verissimum est, neque tamen ulla occurrit moderandi ratio, quia sanis consiliis non obtemperant. Passim denuntio, si judex essem me non minus severe in rabiosos istos impetus vindicaturum, quam rex suis edictis mandat. Pergendum nihilominus, quando nos Deus voluit stultis esse debitores." Calvin to Beza,—Henry, *Leben Calvins*, iii. append. 164.

⁸⁶ "Il n'a tenu qu'à moi que, devant la guerre, gens de faict et d'exécution ne se soyent efforcés de l'exterminer du monde (Guise) lesquels ont esté retenus par ma seule exhortation." Bonnet, ii. 553.

⁸⁷ "Hoc nobis si assidue ob animos et oculos obversetur, eodem decreto constitui etiam nequissimos reges, quo regum auctoritas statuitur; nunquam in animum nobis seditiosæ illæ cogitationes venient, tractandum esse pro meritis regem nec æquum esse, ut subditos ei nos præstemus, qui vicissim regem nobis se non præstet. . . . De privatis hominibus semper loquor. Nam si qui nunc sint populares magistratus ad moderandam regum libidinem constituti (quales

resisted on political grounds ; that no civil rights could outweigh the divine sanction of government, except in cases where a special office was appointed for the purpose. Where there was no such office—where, for instance, the estates of the realm had lost their independence—there was no protection. This is one of the most important and essential characteristics of the politics of the reformers. By making the protection of their religion the principal business of government, they put out of sight its more immediate and universal duties, and made the political objects of the State disappear behind its religious end. A government was to be judged in their eyes only by its fidelity to the Protestant Church. If it fulfilled those requirements, no other complaints against it could be entertained. A tyrannical prince could not be resisted if he was orthodox ; a just prince could be dethroned if he failed in the more essential condition of faith. In this way Protestantism became favourable at once to despotism and to revolution, and was ever ready to sacrifice good government to its own interests. It subverted monarchies, and at the same time denounced those who, for political causes, sought their subversion ; but though the monarchies it subverted were sometimes tyrannical, and the seditions it prevented sometimes revolutionary, the order it defended or sought to establish was never legitimate and free, for it was always invested with the function of religious proselytism,⁸⁸ and with the obligation of removing every traditional, social, or political right or power which could oppose the discharge of that essential duty.

The part Calvin had taken in the death of Servetus obliged him to develop more fully his views on the punishment of heresy. He wrote a short account of the trial,⁸⁹ and

olim erant. . . . ephori. . . . tribuni. . . . demarchi : et qua etiam forte potestate, ut nunc res habent, funguntur in singulis regnis tres ordines, quum primarios conventus peragunt) . . . illos ferocienti regum licentiæ pro officio intercedere non veto." *Institutio*, ii. 493, 495.

⁸⁸ "Quum ergo ita licentiose omnia sibi permittent (Donatistæ), volebant tamen impune manere sua scelera: et in primis tenebant hoc principium: non esse pœnas sumendas, si quis ab aliis dissideret in religionis doctrina: quemadmodum hodie videmus quosdam de hac re nimis cupide contendere. Certum est quid cupiant. Nam si quis ipsos respiciat, sunt impii Dei contemptores: saltem vellent nihil certum esse in religione; ideo labefactare, et quantum in se est etiam convellere nituntur omnia pietatis principia. Ut ergo liceat ipsis evomere virus suum, ideo tantopere litigant pro impunitate, et negant pœnas de hæreticis et blasphemis sumendas esse." *Pr. in Daniele*, v. 51.

⁸⁹ *Defensio Orthodoxæ Fidei* . . . ubi ostenditur Hæreticos jure gladii coercendos esse, 1554.

argued that governments are bound to suppress heresy, and that those who deny the justice of the punishment, themselves deserve it.⁹⁰ The book was signed by all the clergy of Geneva, as Calvin's compurgators. It was generally considered a failure; and a refutation appeared, which was so skilful as to produce a great sensation in the Protestant world.⁹¹ This famous tract, now of extreme rarity, did not, as has been said, "contain the pith of those arguments which have ultimately triumphed in almost every part of Europe;" nor did it preach an unconditional toleration.⁹² But it struck hard at Calvin by quoting a passage from the first edition of his *Institutes*, afterwards omitted, in which he spoke for toleration. "Some of those," says the author, "whom we quote have subsequently written in a different spirit. Nevertheless, we have cited the earlier opinion as the true one, as it was expressed under the pressure of persecution."⁹³ The first edition, we are informed by Calvin himself, was written for the purpose of vindicating the Protestants who were put to death, and of putting a stop to the

⁹⁰ "Non modo liberum esse magistratibus pœnas sumere de cœlestis doctrinæ corruptoribus, sed divinitus esse mandatum, ut pestiferis erroribus impunitatem dare nequeant, quin desciscant ab officii sui fide. . . . Nunc vero quisquis hæreticis et blasphemis injuste pœnam infligi contenderet, sciens et volens se obstringet blasphemiae reatu. . . . Ubi a suis fundamentis convellitur religio, detestandæ in Deum blasphemiae proferuntur, impiis et pestiferis dogmatibus in exitium rapiuntur animæ; denique ubi palam defectio ab unico Deo puraque doctrina tentatur, ad extremum illud remedium descendere necesse." See Schenkel, iii. 389; Dyer, *Life of Calvin*, 354; Henry, iii. 234.

⁹¹ *De Hæreticis an sint persequendi*: Magdeburgi, 1554. Chataillon, to whom it is generally attributed, was not the author. See Heppe, *Theodor Beza*, 37.

⁹² Hallam, *Literature of Europe*, ii. 81; Schlosser, *Leben des Beza*, 55. This is proved by the following passage from the dedication: "This I say not to favour the heretics, whom I abhor, but because there are here two dangerous rocks to be avoided. In the first place, that no man should be deemed a heretic when he is not . . . and that the real rebel be distinguished from the Christian who, by following the teaching and example of his Master, necessarily causes separation from the wicked and unbelieving. The other danger is, lest the real heretics be not more severely punished than the discipline of the Church requires." Baum, *Theodor Beza*, i. 215.

⁹³ "Multis piis hominibus in Gallia exustis grave passim apud Germanos odium ignes illi excitaverant, sparsi sunt, ejus restinguendi causa, improbi ac mendaces libelli, non alios tam crudeliter tractari, quam Anabaptistas ac turbulentos homines, qui perversis deliriis non religionem modo sed totum ordinem politicum convellerent. . . . Hæc mihi edendæ Institutionis causa fuit, primum ut ab injusta contumelia vindicarem fratres meos, quorum mors pretiosa erat in conspectu Domini; deinde quum multis miseris eadem visitarent supplicia, pro illis dolor saltem aliquis et sollicitudo exterarum gentes tangeret." *Præfatio in Psalmos*. See *Historia Litteraria de Calvini Institutione*, in *Scrinium Antiquarium*, ii. 452.

persecution. It was anonymous, and naturally dwelt on the principles of toleration.

Although this book did not denounce all intolerance, and although it was extremely moderate, Calvin and his friends were filled with horror. "What remains of Christianity," exclaimed Beza, "if we silently admit what this man has expectorated in his preface? . . . Since the beginning of Christianity no such blasphemy was ever heard."⁹⁴ Beza undertook to defend Calvin in an elaborate work,⁹⁵ in which it was easy for him to cite the authority of all the leading reformers in favour of the practice of putting heretics to death, and in which he reproduced all the arguments of those who had written on the subject before him. More systematic than Calvin, he first of all excludes those who are not Christians, the Jews, Turks, and heathen, whom his inquiry does not touch; among Christians, he proceeds to say, some are schismatics, who sin against the peace of the Church, or disbelievers, who reject her doctrine. Among these, some err in all simplicity; and if their error is not very grave, and if they do not seduce others, they need not be punished.⁹⁶ But obstinate heretics are far worse than parricides, and deserve death, even if they repent.⁹⁷ It is the duty of the State to punish them, for the whole ecclesiastical order is upheld by the political.⁹⁸ In early ages this power was exercised by the temporal sovereigns; they convoked councils, punished heretics, promulgated dogmas.

⁹⁴ Baum, i. 206. "Telles gens," says Calvin, "seroient contents qu'il n'y eust ne loy, ne bride au monde. Voilà pourquoy ils ont basti ce beau livre *De non comburendis Hæreticis*, où ils ont falsifié les noms tant des villes que des personnes, non pour aultre cause sinon pource que le dit livre est farcy de blasphèmes insupportables." Bonnet, ii. 18.

⁹⁵ *De Hæreticis a civili Magistratu puniendis*, 1554.

⁹⁶ "Absit autem a nobis, ut in eos, qui vel simplicitate peccant, sine aliorum pernicio et insigni blasphemia, vel in explicando quopiam Scripturæ loco dissident a recepta opinione, magistratum armemus." *Tractatus Theologici*, i. 95.

⁹⁷ This was sometimes the practice in Catholic countries, where heresy was equivalent to treason. Duke William of Bavaria ordered obstinate Anabaptists to be burnt; those who recanted, to be beheaded. "Welcher revocir, den soll man köpfen; welcher nicht revocir, den soll man brennen." Jörg, 715.

⁹⁸ "Ex quibus omnibus una conjunctio efficitur, istos quibus hæretici videntur non esse puniendi, opinionem in Ecclesiam Dei conari longe omnium pestilentissimam invehere et ex diametro repugnantem doctrinæ primum a Deo Patre proditæ, deinde a Christo instauratæ, ab universa denique Ecclesia orthodoxa perpetuo consensu usurpatæ, ut mihi quidem magis absurde facere videantur quam si sacrilegas aut parricidas puniendos negarent, quum sint istis omnibus hæretici infinitis partibus deteriores." *Tract. Theol.* i. 143.

The Papacy afterwards arose, in evil times, and was a great calamity; but it was preferable a hundred times to the anarchy which was defended under the name of merciful toleration.

The circumstances of the condemnation of Servetus make it the most perfect and characteristic example of the abstract intolerance of the reformers. Servetus was guilty of no political crime; he was not an inhabitant of Geneva, and was on the point of leaving it, and nothing immoral could be attributed to him. He was not even an advocate of absolute toleration.⁹⁹ The occasion of his apprehension was a dispute between a Catholic and a Protestant, as to which party was most zealous in suppressing egregious errors. Calvin, who had long before declared that if Servetus came to Geneva, he should never leave it alive,¹⁰⁰ did all he could to obtain his condemnation by the Inquisition at Vienne. At Geneva he was anxious that the sentence should be death,¹⁰¹ and in this he was encouraged by the Swiss churches, but especially by Beza, Farel, Bullinger, and Peter Martyr.¹⁰²

⁹⁹ "Verum est quod correctione non exspectata Ananiam et Sapphiram occidit Petrus. Quia Spiritus Sanctus tunc maxime vicens, quem spreverant, docebat esse incorrigibiles, in malitia obstinatos. Hoc crimen est morte simpliciter dignum et apud Deum et apud homines. In aliis autem criminibus, ubi Spiritus Sanctus speciale quid non docet, ubi non est inveterata malitia, aut obstinatio certa non apparet aut atrocitas magna, correctionem per alias castigationes sperare potius debemus." Servetus, *Restitutio Christianismi*, 656; Henry, iii. 235.

¹⁰⁰ "Namsi venerit, modo valeat mea autoritas, vivum exire nunquam patiar." Calvin to Farel, in Henry, iii., append. 65. Audin, *Vie de Calvin*, ii. 314. Dyer, 544.

¹⁰¹ "Spero capitale saltem fore iudicium: pœnæ vero atrocitatem remitti cupio" (Calvin to Farel,—Henry, iii. 189). Dr. Henry makes no attempt to clear Calvin of the imputation of having caused the death of Servetus. Nevertheless he proposed, some years later, that the three-hundredth anniversary of the execution should be celebrated in the Church of Geneva by a demonstration. "It ought to declare itself in a body, in a manner worthy of our principles, admitting that in past times the authorities of Geneva were mistaken, loudly proclaiming toleration, which is truly the crown of our Church, and paying due honour to Calvin, because he had no hand in the business (*parcequ'il n'a pas trempé dans cette affaire*), of which he has unjustly borne the whole burden." The impudence of this declaration is surpassed by the editor of the French periodical from which we extract it. He appends to the words in our parenthesis the following note: "We underline in order to call attention to this opinion of Dr. Henry, who is so thoroughly acquainted with the whole question." *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français*, ii. 114.

¹⁰² "Qui scripserunt de non plectendis hæreticis, semper mihi visi sunt non parum errare" (Farel to Blaarer,—Henry, iii. 202). During the trial he wrote to Calvin: "If you desire to diminish the horrible punishment, you will act as a friend towards your most dangerous enemy. If I were to seduce any body from the true faith, I should consider myself worthy of death; I

All the Protestant authorities, therefore, agreed in the justice of putting a writer to death in whose case all the secondary motives of intolerance were wanting. Servetus was not a party-leader. He had no followers, who threatened to upset the peace and unity of the Church. His doctrine was speculative, without power or attraction for the masses, like Lutheranism; and without consequences subversive of morality, or affecting in any direct way the existence of society, like Anabaptism.¹⁰³ He had nothing to do with Geneva, and his persecutors would have rejoiced if he had been put to death elsewhere. "Bayle," says Hallam,¹⁰⁴ "has an excellent remark on this controversy." Bayle's remark is as follows: "Whenever Protestants complain, they are answered by the right which Calvin and Beza recognised in magistrates; and to this day there has been nobody who has not failed pitifully against this *argumentum ad hominem*."

No question of the merits of the Reformation, or of persecution, is involved in an inquiry as to the source and connexion of the opinions on toleration held by the Protestant reformers. No man's sentiments on the rightfulness of religious persecution will be affected by the theories we have described, and they have no bearing whatever on doctrinal controversy. Those who, in agreement with the principle of the early Church, that men are free in matters of conscience,

cannot judge differently of another than of myself." Schmidt, Farel und Viret, 33.

Before sentence was pronounced, Bullinger wrote to Beza: "Quid vero amplissimus Senatus Genevensis ageret cum blasphemio illo nebulone Serveto. Si sapit et officium suum facit, cædit, ut totus orbis videat Genevam Christi gloriam cupere servatam" (Baum, i. 204). With reference to Socinus, he wrote: "Sentio ego spirituali gladio abscindendos esse homines hæreticos." Henry, iii. 225.

Peter Martyr Vermili also gave in his adhesion to Calvin's policy: "De Serveto Hispano, quid aliud dicam non habeo, nisi eum fuisse genuinum Diaboli filium, cujus pestifera et detestanda doctrina, undique profliganda est, neque magistratus, qui de illo supplicium extremum sumpsit, accusandus est, cum emendationis nulla indicia in eo possent deprehendi, illiusque blasphemie omnino intolerabiles essent." Loci Communes, 1114. See Schlosser, Leben des Beza und des Peter Martyr Vermili, 512.

Zanchi, who at the instigation of Bullinger also published a treatise De Hæreticis coercendis, says of Beza's work: "Non poterit non probari summopere piis omnibus. Satis superque respondit quidem ille novis istis academicis, ita ut supervacanea et inutilis omnino videatur mea tractatio." Baum, i. 232.

¹⁰³ "The trial of Servetus," says a very ardent Calvinist, "is illegal only in one point: the crime, if crime there be, had not been committed at Geneva; but long before the Councils had usurped the unjust privilege of judging strangers stopping at Geneva, although the crimes they were accused of had not been committed there." Haag, La France Protestante, iii. 129.

¹⁰⁴ Literature of Europe, ii. 82.

condemn all intolerance, will censure Catholics and Protestants alike. Those who pursue the same principle one step farther, and practically invert it, by insisting on the right and duty not only of professing, but of extending the truth, must, as it seems to us, approve the conduct both of Protestants and Catholics; unless they make the justice of the persecution depend on the truth of the doctrine defended, in which case they will divide on both sides. Such persons, again, as are more strongly impressed with the cruelty of actual executions than with the danger of false theories, may concentrate their indignation on the Catholics of Languedoc and Spain; while those who judge principles, not by the accidental details attending their practical realisation, but by the reasoning on which they are founded, will arrive at a verdict adverse to the Protestants. These comparative inquiries, however, have little serious interest. If we give our admiration to tolerance, we must remember that the Spanish Moors, and the Turks in Europe, have been more tolerant than the Christians; and if we admit the principle of intolerance, and judge its application by particular conditions, we are bound to acknowledge that the Romans had better reason for persecution than any modern State, since their empire was involved in the decline of the old religion with which it was bound up, whereas no Christian policy has been subverted by the mere presence of religious dissent. The comparison is moreover entirely unreasonable; for there is nothing in common between Catholic and Protestant intolerance. The Church began with the principle of liberty, both as her claim and as her rule; and external circumstances forced intolerance upon her, after her spirit of unity had triumphed, in spite both of the freedom she proclaimed and of the persecution she suffered. Protestantism set up intolerance as an imperative precept, and as a part of its doctrine; and it was forced to admit toleration by the necessities of its position, after the rigorous penalties it imposed had failed to arrest the process of internal dissolution.¹⁰⁵

At the time when this involuntary change occurred, the sects that caused it were the bitterest enemies of the toleration they demanded. In the same age, the Puritans and the

¹⁰⁵ This is the ground taken by two Dutch divines in answer to the consultation of John of Nassau, in 1579: "Neque in imperio, neque in Galliis, neque in Belgio speranda esset unquam libertas in externo religionis exercitio nostris . . . si non diversarum religionum exercitia in una eademque provincia toleranda. . . . Sic igitur gladio adversus nos armabimus Pontificios, si hanc hypothesin tuebimur, quod exercitium religionis alteri parti nullum prorsus relinqui debeat." *Serinium Antiquarium*, i. 335.

Catholics sought a refuge beyond the Atlantic from the persecution which they suffered together under the Stuarts. Flying for the same reason, and from the same oppression, they were enabled respectively to carry out their own views in the colonies which they founded in Massachusetts and Maryland; and the history of those two States exhibits faithfully the contrast between the two Churches. The Catholic emigrants established, for the first time in modern history, a government in which religion was free, and with it the germ of that religious liberty which now prevails in America. The Puritans, on the other hand, revived with greater severity the penal laws of the mother country. In process of time, the liberty of conscience in the Catholic colony was forcibly abolished by the neighbouring Protestants of Virginia; while on the borders of Massachusetts the new State of Rhode Island was formed by a party of fugitives from the intolerance of their fellow-colonists.

Communicated Articles.

MARSHALL ON CHRISTIAN MISSIONS.*

MR. MARSHALL'S comparative History of Missions will completely justify the expectations which he raised by his specimen volume on China. The unction and liveliness which there delighted his readers have not deserted him, and his style is equally happy, whether he has to edify us with the self-sacrifice of the Catholic missionaries, or to amuse us with the misadventures of their rivals. And he is happier, if possible, in his subject than in his style, for he has chosen an argument, important and yet new,—new in its unity and totality, however familiar it may be in its parts. His subject may be called the complement of that of the first portion of Dr. Döllinger's late book, which traces the developments of Protestantism in the civilised races of Europe, while Mr. Marshall traces its developments among the half-civilised and barbarous races of the other quarters of the earth. These two divisions exhaust the subject; and there is no doubt that a comprehensive survey of both, honestly made, would have the happiest effect upon those persons, "neither frankly Protestant nor effectually Catholic," who only compare themselves with themselves,† and refuse to look beyond the limits of their own coterie or their own parish, and to take a comprehensive survey of the action of their community upon the world. Such persons may learn a great deal from Mr. Marshall's volumes, unless he has laboured in vain. But if those, for whom he chiefly wrote, to whom his arguments are addressed, and who explain the whole purpose of his volumes, refuse to hear him, the results of his admirable industry will not be lost; he will be read with edification and delight by numbers of Catholics, who will appreciate both his purpose and his style.

The subject is one that "has led" the writer "out of the region of speculative controversy into that of historical facts;" not that his business has been that of the historian; his work is not a history, but, as he calls it, a review of a history; a collection of opinions, judgments, and results, rather than a development of these results from their causes. It is necessary to bear this in mind, or we should perhaps expect more from the book than we shall find in it. The

* Christian Missions: their Agents, their Method, and their Results. By T. W. M. Marshall. 3 vols. Burns and Lambert.

† Vol. iii. p. 468.

author never proposes to seek for the reasons why missions of the same kind fail here, and are fruitful there; why converts of one race are tenacious of the faith, while other races quickly relapse; and the like questions which occur at each page. His one argument, the same through the three volumes, patiently carried on in spite of its monotony, is this—"Apostolic success is the test of Christian truth—'by their fruits ye shall know them.' The universal experience of the day is, that Catholic missions to the heathen have every where succeeded, Protestant missions uniformly failed. Therefore the Catholic religion is Christian truth, and Protestantism is not so."

The argument is certainly a happy one. It concerns one of those living characteristics of the living Church which are manifest to all eyes. It is rather a token than an argument—a sign than a syllogism; it is addressed, not to a reasoning faculty which few have cultivated, but to a seeing faculty, which the peasant has as perfectly as the philosopher. It is as simple as St. Augustine's famous note,—*tenet me in Ecclesiae gremio ipsum Catholicæ nomen*,—"the very name Catholic, which no sect can usurp, and which none finds it possible to deny to the Church, keeps me in her bosom." It is like that other token, "that Church can alone be the infallible Church which alone refuses to admit its fallibility." And all three rest on this ground, that God Almighty, by some mysterious influence, compels sects to renounce the name Catholic for themselves, and to give it to the Church; to renounce the claim of infallibility for themselves, though they deny it to the Church also; and to expend treasures and toil in a manifestly fruitless attempt to convert the heathen, while they allow that the Church, with a mere fraction of the cost in money, does many thousand times as much.

Still it must be owned that Mr. Marshall's argument, however useful, is not so absolute as the others, because it requires a preliminary discussion of matters which he has omitted to consider. He who makes success in converting the heathen the test of religious truth, has to explain the successes of Brahminism, Buddhism, and Islamism, the great missionary religions of the East. The multitudes they converted were enormous, and the tenacity of their converts has been astonishing; no Christian missions have as yet had an equal numerical success; yet in none of the three gentile systems was the doctrine true, or its apostles called by God to their work.

And if the argument is to be restricted to Christian

missions, and all other missionary successes are to be (somewhat arbitrarily) excluded, still it requires due allowance to be made for the early successes of Nestorian missionaries, who converted Central and Eastern Asia up to the middle of China; of Arian missionaries, who converted the Goths and Vandals, and other Teutonic nations; and of the orthodox Greeks, who, since the schism, however sterile they may be now, have converted many of the Slavonic populations.

These examples would show that there are other possible elements and causes of missionary success besides the truth of the doctrine preached, and the divine vocation of the apostle who preaches it. The first element of such success is asceticism; and at various periods in history the false diabolical asceticism of pagan religions has been as efficacious in missionary results as the true asceticism of Christianity. Those races which have not been transformed in the Medean caldron of modern European civilisation have at the bottom of their souls an obscure feeling which tells them that religion is a corporeally painful sacrifice. The feast and orgies may come after the sacrifice; but first comes the starvation, the flagellation, the cutting with knives, the mutilation. Their hearts bend before the preacher whom they see doing severe penances, and inflicting upon himself cruel disciplines. Without the forms of asceticism, there is no means of converting these men. Religion must be preached to them as religion, not as civilisation; as severity, not as comfort. There may be ambition in the teacher, but none of those civilised appliances which, however poor, must look like luxury to the savage. The road of asceticism is the only way to prepare the barbarian for civilisation. Only religious severity or slavery could relieve his squalor by teaching him to labour for the means of life; and could fix his habits and utilise his powers by making him obedient to an intellect higher than his own.

But to do this, the preacher must be faithful to the ascetic ideal of descending in all matters but those connected with religion to the level of the savage whom he teaches, just as St. Francis adopted the habits and the way of life of the poor serfs around him. The apostolic missionary first received in the cœnacle the tongues of the nations he was to convert, that he might address them in their own jargon, and teach them by means of the rude ideas and images with which they were familiar. He brought them no new mode of life or thought; he only wanted to touch the soul. He did not carry to them a Gospel of riches, health, or power; he had no distinctive civilisation to bring them in lieu of

their own ; but he took with him a religion that was compatible with every civilisation, that neither disdained the most imperfect nor gaped in admiration at the most perfect, and that was Catholic because it could coexist with every possible human condition. The savage Galla might remain a savage Galla, and yet become as good a Christian as the most holy prelate in Europe. So now, the Catholic missionary accommodates himself to every thing, even to the rudest hut ; and if he any where finds a savage too stupid to build a hut, he will go out to him, and sit by him under his tree or in his cave, and patiently teach him, not to build huts and weave cloth to clothe himself, but to believe in, to hope in, and to love the God of the Christians. So universal an application does the Catholic missionary give to the precept of St. Paul to the new converts—*Unusquisque in quâ vocatione vocatus est, in eâ permaneat apud Deum.*

And if asceticism in the missionary is necessary to make his message probable in the eyes of the barbarians to whom he preaches, it is equally necessary to the missionary himself, to keep him up to his vocation, to preserve his spiritual superiority, and to prevent his sinking to the level of the barbarians, with whom he has cast his lot. It has been said by a great philosopher, that "asceticism is a solitary and celestial civilisation of the individual," a refuge against "the savage life of corrupt society;" and therefore the proper correlative and corrective of barbarism. It is simple, independent, self-centred, self-reliant, unbending to external influences, but at the same time stoically tolerant of them. The civilisation of society, on the contrary, is a composite thing, which makes the members of society mutually dependent on each other, and tends to destroy the stoical independence which characterises the ascetic. It is obliged to be intolerant of the contact and intermixture of barbarism. When it transports itself to a barbarous country, it must either hold itself high and aloof from the native population, or if it allows them to mingle with it, it must gradually sink nearly to their level. The only kind of civilisation that can afford to isolate itself from its kindred and people, and to sojourn among barbarians, admitting them to familiar intercourse without being defiled by them, is the ascetic or individual civilisation.

Some nations have more aptitude for an individual civilisation, having something in common with asceticism ; some for a social civilisation. The English, who have carried the latter to the highest development yet known, are a by-word among races of less political, but greater individual, culture

for their abject dependence on their own social systems. We laugh at the political despotism which other races endure. They reply, "You may talk of the despotism of Nero and Tiberius; but the real tyranny is the tyranny of your next-door neighbour. What law is so cruel as the law of doing what he does? What yoke so galling as the necessity of being like him? What espionage of despotism comes to your door so effectually as the eye of the man who lives at your door? Public opinion is a fermenting influence, and it exacts obedience to itself; it requires us to think other men's thoughts, to speak other men's words, and to follow other men's habits." The individualism of other races is a cause of the anarchy into which they naturally run, and for which the only remedy is despotism. Take one of the gay atoms out of the unorganised society of France, and place him amidst barbarians; he is almost as much at home there as in his own land. Tocqueville enlarges upon the ease with which the lively Frenchman adapts himself to the manners of the wild Indian in Canada, where he lives in one of the huts of the tribe like a brother; while the unbending Englishman keeps the savages at a distance, and jealously surrounds himself in the wilderness with every appliance and every institution of civilisation that he can carry with him. The civilisation of the Frenchman is vague, individual, adaptable to any circumstances, but soon swallowed up and assimilated by the race into which he throws himself. The civilisation of the Englishman is weak in the individual, but strong in the mass. It depends on unity with its original source. It admits of no compromise, no change which would cut it off from society at home. Hence it is concentrated, narrow, harsh, intolerant. The Englishman is conscious that his strength consists not in himself, but in the society of which he forms a part, and therefore he will never willingly put off his national character. He emigrates to conquer, to rule, to transform, or to destroy; not to descend to the level of the race that he conquers, and to make a compromise between its civilisation and his own. A conquering race which bears its own civilisation thus indelibly marked upon it, can never have the true missionary genius which wins inferior races. Who ever heard of conversions by Greek and Roman missionaries in the palmy days of Greek and Roman greatness? Similarly, nature, which has given in these days political greatness to the English, has at the same time denied them the genius of the missionary. The French have it; but at the same time, as a nation, they are exhibiting to the world a wonderful instance of thorough political incapacity.

Hence, even in natural character, the Frenchman is more fit for solitary missionary enterprise than the Englishman. The Frenchman goes out without any resources but those which he carries within him; the English missionary tries to take with him his national civilisation. This is true of the English and Irish priest in India and Australia, as well as of the Protestant missionary. The latter, however, exaggerates the peculiarity of his nation; he goes out with security for his salary, for a comfortable home, for the society of his countrymen,—with wife, and servants, and pianoforte. All this is necessary for him, for without it he would be degrading himself to the level of the society he goes to convert. But at the same time it is destructive of his mission; for it is not only a token of his hostility to that asceticism which, to unsophisticated nature, lies at the root of religion, but is also a sign that he comes to preach not merely a new religion, but an alien civilisation also—that he comes to change not only morals and belief, but customs and manners—that the religion which he offers is not one which the Indian or savage can receive, and remain Indian or savage; but one which is to transform him into a European, into a superficial resemblance of the missionary who preaches to him. But this is what inferior races most obstinately resist. The hatred of the Celtic peasantry of France for that Germanic civilisation which marks the traditional Frankish rule is a faint example of the sullen scorn with which the savage refuses to accept the ideas of the civilised races of mankind.

The Protestant missionary, then, cannot convert to his religion, for he lacks the great token of asceticism. Nor can he force the barbarian to accept his civilisation; this can only be done by conquest and subsequent intermarriage. There only remains the influence of his example; and his example recommends a civilisation which is a state of artificial luxury and enjoyment, only adapted for people who have by a long education been prepared for it, and is deadly as opium or brandy to the reckless savage. Slavery would be better for him than such a fatal gift, for slavery would teach him habits of civilisation and order; but the civilised routine of the missionary teaches no lesson of labour, of self-denial, or sacrifice. It allows the savage to keep his listless ways, but covers over the void with a ragged mantle of self-indulgence and hypocrisy, and thus deprives him of his rude virtues without giving him any better ones in exchange. The Protestant missionary cannot be an ascetic, it is contrary both to his religion and to his civilisation. Neither can he condescend, like the apostolic missionary, to the degraded

beings to whom he preaches. Such condescension, without the safeguard of asceticism, would only degrade him to their moral level.

Mr. Marshall, then, is mistaken in supposing that the failure of English, American, and German Protestant missionaries to convert the barbarous or half-barbarous pagans is simply a token of the falsity of the religion they preach. Other causes, even more than their heresy, produce this result. Another mistake is, his quarrel with the English Government in India for deriving a revenue from administering the property of the temples.* He may answer, that he only echoes the reproaches which Exeter Hall itself utters, and that it is not his business to defend a Protestant government from the charges of its own friends. But the cause of truth requires us to be rather more nice in the selection of our weapons. Surely, to tax the pilgrims of Juggernaut, and to get 17,000*l.* a year out of the administration of temple property in Madras, is, of the two, rather a discouragement than an encouragement of idolatry. To tax idols is not putting a premium upon their worship, but to exempt them from taxation might be. If the government may tolerate idolatry, it may also see that the temple property is duly administered, and that peace is kept at the temple feasts. A Catholic government would deserve no reproach for sending policemen to keep order at a Methodist revival, or Mormon preaching. It would be abominable to go out of the way to honour, to propagate, or to preserve heathen ceremonies, but on any thing short of this it is difficult to fasten blame. Toleration implies the protection of the liberty of that which is tolerated. The question on which all depends is, whether idolatrous rites are to be tolerated in India; and in answering this question Mr. Marshall would have found St. Thomas not only a safer but a more liberal guide than either Mr. Close or Mr. Peggs. "Man's government," says St. Thomas, "is derived from God's, and ought to imitate it. But God, almighty and all-good as He is, permits certain evils in the world which He might prohibit, lest in preventing them, He should prevent greater good, or even cause worse evils. So human rulers are right in tolerating some evils, lest some good should be prevented, or some worse evils incurred; as St. Augustine says, *Aufer meretrices de rebus humanis, turbaveris omnia libidinibus*. So, though infidels commit sin in their rites, they may be tolerated, either for some good which accrues from them, or some evil which is avoided. . . . For this cause the Church has some-

* Vol. i. pp. 417-421.

times tolerated even the rites of heretics and *heathens*, when the multitude of unbelievers has been great."* The analogy suggested by St. Augustine of the toleration of places of vicious resort might have taught Mr. Marshall to be more cautious. The captious criticism of the forerunners of our Exeter-Hall worthies upon the management of such places by the Roman government, ought to have made him refrain from an equally groundless criticism of the English government for a perfectly analogous policy in India.

But Mr. Marshall's eyes have been fixed too firmly on the matter he has undertaken to describe, to allow him to divert his attention to analogies, or other collateral topics. The subject is one which required in its historian an immense fund of general historical knowledge. To this Mr. Marshall cannot pretend. Hence he should have been more careful not to assert as true, things which he can only have hoped, but cannot have known, to be so. The second paragraph in his book could not have been written if he had been aware that, at least as late as 1847, it was forbidden, under pain of excommunication, to attempt the conversion of a Mahometan in Syria. There was abundant political reason for this. Perhaps a fair inquiry might have satisfied Mr. Marshall that there were also political reasons to be alleged for the similar facts which he reprobates as unexampled atrocities. We fear also that it will be pronounced to be an unpardonable fault in a comparative historian of Catholic and Protestant missions, to have omitted all mention of the quarrel between Dominicans and Jesuits in his account of the China mission; and to have contented himself with the barest allusion to the Goa schism in his account of the missions of India and Ceylon.

It would have been better also if he had been satisfied with letting facts speak for themselves, without going out of his way to declare that the special mission of England is to make the conversion of the heathen impossible, and to threaten her with speedy vengeance and collapse in consequence. In his anxiety to contrast our ill-treatment of the aborigines of the countries we have colonised with the gentleness of Catholic colonists, he allows nothing for different circumstances; indeed he assumes them to be alike, and thence concludes that the difference of treatment results purely from the difference of religion. A French Catholic writer might have taught him to be more equitable in assigning the causes for the extirpation of the Indians from British America, and their increase in Spanish America.

* S. Thos. Sum. 2da 2dæ, q. 10. art. 11.

These tribes, says M. Gobineau, see beside them a great and increasing race, whose ships float by thousands on all their seas and rivers. They know that the strength of their masters is irresistible. They have no hope of ever seeing their country cleared of the intruders. They know that their continent is destined to belong to the Europeans. "They have only to open their eyes to be convinced of the vigour of that foreign civilisation which offers a more certain support to life than the chances of the chase or of the fishery. When they buy their brandy, their clothes, their guns, they know that even their gross tastes may be better satisfied in the new system than in their own. It invites them, it begs them to approach, it bribes them and flatters them, to induce them to come in; but they refuse; they prefer to retreat from wilderness to wilderness; they bury themselves deeper and deeper in their forests. They leave every thing, even the graves of their fathers. They know that they are doomed; but a mysterious repugnance keeps them aloof; and, with all their wonder at the strength of the white race, their mind, their nature, and their blood revolt at the idea of community with it.

"In Spanish America, people fancy there is less aversion of the natives for the Europeans. It is because the home government left them from the first under their own rulers. It never tried to civilise them. It allowed them to keep their customs and laws, and, provided they were Christians, only asked them for tribute. It did not colonise. When the conquest was once made, it resigned itself to an indolent toleration, and its only oppression was by fits and starts. Thus the Indians of Spanish America are less miserable, and are allowed to live, while the neighbours of the English will perish without mercy."

There is no doubt that the first striking difference between the Spanish and English colonies is this,—that the Spaniards undertook to discharge towards the natives the duties which higher religion and civilisation imposed upon them, whilst the English quietly ignored the natives altogether. Undoubtedly the first cause of this is the fact that the Church was a link to unite Spaniards and natives, and that this link was wanting in the English colonies. This is a glory for the Church, and, as far as it goes, an evidence of her sanctity and truth.

But there are secondary physical and political reasons for the difference between the two sets of colonies, which prevent it from being as absolute a criterion of the two religions as Mr. Marshall desires to make it. For instance,

within the tropics, labour is hateful and deadly to Europeans. In cold and temperate climates, it is a pleasure and a healthy exercise. The Spaniards in the south needed the natives to work for them. The English in the north worked for themselves; but as they proceeded southwards, they also had to provide themselves with a race of labourers accustomed to the hot sun. And here they were less fortunate than the Spaniards. The natives of English America lived by the chase, and could not be brought to cultivate the soil. In Spanish America, the natives had many fixed agricultural settlements. The English could not utilise the natives around them; the Spanish found in their neighbours exactly what they wanted.

Again, it is a fact in politics, that colonising governments use the aborigines well, while private adventurers ill-treat them. Now the English colonies were generally founded by emigrants, who had nothing whatever to do with the home government. They were generally sectarians, exclusive in their religion, flying from the persecution of penal laws, and not members of a great Catholic religious organisation. In both respects the Spaniards were entirely different. The Spanish colonist went forth as a servant and emissary of the State; he worked for it, and under its guidance and control, and at the same time as a working member of a Church which had the same duties towards the natives as towards the colonist. Thus the Spanish American was under a double control of general laws, from which the English American was entirely free.

The English colonists set up for themselves; they emigrated to insure freedom from control, not to be agents of a home government. And the home government could only exercise a precarious and imperfect control over them. But now, where a people is divided into classes, one subject to another, a strong supreme power is necessary as much for Catholics as for Protestants and Pagans, to watch the masters and to protect the slave; and thus to preserve both for the interests of the State. And, indeed, it is only this subordination of classes that makes a strong despotic government possible. For the relation of the masters to the slaves is a compensation to the master which makes him tolerant of the oppression exercised over himself by the government; while to the slave it appears either as a protection against his master, or at least as tending to make the master a protection to the slave against the oppression of the government. For this reason, absolute monarchy delights in castes, in the modification of citizenship according to dis-

inctions of blood, white, black, or blue, and in slavery, which, even when there is no monarchy, tends to make the state absolute, and causes its absolutism to be a blessing. The terror which the Frankish part of French society has for the socialism of the Gallic classes, and the envy of the latter against the former, make both classes tolerant of the despotism of their government.

English colonisation was a social movement, carried on in defiance of the government, to escape religious oppression, civil troubles, or the miseries of too numerous a population. But the Spanish colonists had the best possible reasons to remain at home. No man left home intending to die out of Spain. The whole colonisation had to be organised by the public authority, or it would never have taken place. This gave it a political character. It was the superabundant force of Spain that sent forth its colonies. But it was the weakness, the sickness of England, in the time of her greatest ignominy under the Stuart rule, that cast forth her children to shift for themselves. Therefore the English colonists did shift for themselves, because they had only themselves to rely on; and they naturally flourished and grew up to a vigorous independence.

But the Spanish colonies were always of hot-house growth; they dwindled as the fires went out in the stoves; they declined with the decline of the mother country; and when they were violently separated from her, they showed that they had no vitality in them.

If the English government had colonised, it would have dealt with the natives as gently as the Spanish government did. It would have followed Bacon's advice, who said, that colonists should be planted "in a pure soil, where people are not displanted to the end to plant in others; for else it is rather an extirpation than a plantation;" or, "if you plant where savages are, . . . use them justly and graciously, with sufficient guard nevertheless; and do not win their favour by helping them to invade their enemies. . . . And send oft of them over to the country that plants, that they may see a better condition than their own, and commend it when they return" (*Essay on Plantation*). And in a paper of advice to George Villiers, then prime minister, after laying down rules for colonisation by the government, Bacon adds, among his cautions—"to make no extirpation of the natives under pretence of planting religion; God surely will no way be pleased with such sacrifices." In that day our forefathers thought their own hands clean in this matter, and professed a great horror of the Spaniards' cruelty. For, in truth, the

Spanish adventurers were as bad as the English have proved themselves to be. But the strong hand of the Spanish government restrained the one, while the English government was too feeble and too hated to influence the others.

Another defect that struck me in reading Mr. Marshall's book, is that, in spite of the excellence and liveliness of his style, the length of his work gives it a certain monotony, which is not lessened by his failure to discriminate between the various races brought under missionary influence. Chinese, New Zealander, and American Indian, are all the same to him; the only thing he attends to is the various success of the missions. He sacrifices all the life which he might easily have given his book by a better appreciation of the different national characters.

In other respects, his eloquence and rhetoric have led him astray. It does not suit the historian to be a controversialist. He should be a critic, not a polemic. For a polemic has a purpose; he fights for an idea; and ideas are more apt to lead than to follow, even when such stubborn things as facts have to be dealt with. Moreover, though the facts he describes are enough to make him angry, he should not give the reins to his anger. *Facit indignatio versus*: indignation may pour itself out in sounding periods, but it is not a kind of thing that gives a man power or right to mount the prophet's chair, and to declare what is about to happen. Whenever Mr. Marshall is much moved, he is apt to become prophetic. Throughout the volumes, I find mutterings of a coming retribution; but towards the end (vol. iii. p. 494) the writer tells us plainly, with an assurance worthy of Dr. Cumming, that we have arrived "at the eve of that reign of Antichrist, of which the events of the sixteenth century were the dismal presage, and of which the phenomena of our own are the certain harbinger." An absorbing idea like this, imported from without into history, and not a mere interpretation of facts by experience, is so anti-historical, that I doubt whether a mind under its fascination can investigate facts without bias, or record them without conscious purpose.

This criticism applies only partially to one who does not pretend to be a historian, but only a reviewer, or advocate of a particular historical view. Mr. Marshall's argument, though not so absolute as he imagines, is a very important one, and will be more important when dispassionately discussed. The object at present is to popularise the argument, and not to work it out scientifically. This justifies his one-sidedness, and enables me to say that he has exhibited judg-

ment and prudence in writing a book which enthusiasts will delight in, instead of one addressed, if to cooler heads, perhaps also to colder hearts.

Mr. Marshall begins with comparing the means used respectively by Catholics and Protestants, in order to bring Christianity home to the minds and consciences of the heathen. The Catholic missionaries make use of personal intercourse, and the example of a life of self-sacrifice and asceticism, often ended by martyrdom. The Protestant missionaries chiefly depend upon the influence of printed books and tracts, on which the societies spend incredible sums. But as the Protestant missionaries have hitherto chiefly come from an uneducated class, and have been brought up at second-rate Dissenting colleges, where probably the best Latin or Greek exercise would deserve a *pluck* at Oxford or Cambridge, it is not to be expected that they have succeeded in their translations of Scripture and edifying tracts into the literary languages of the East, or into the barbarous jargons of savage tribes. In the latter case the versions are often perfectly unintelligible; in the other, unendurably illiterate and vulgar. By a very easy transition, in one Eastern version the text, "Judge not, that ye be not judged," is transformed into, "Do no justice, that no justice be done unto you." The Chinese or Brahmin literate, who reckons some of the compositions of the old Jesuit missionaries among the classics of his language, cannot be persuaded to read a page of the clumsy compositions of their Protestant rivals.

After his chapter on the "Bible and the Heathen," Mr. Marshall gives parallel and contrasted histories of the Catholic and Protestant missions in China, India, Ceylon, the Antipodes, Oceanica, Africa, the Levant, and America. His histories of the Catholic missions are chiefly biographical, and are compiled mostly from Catholic sources, but checked by Protestant accounts. His stories of Protestant missions are almost entirely made up of passages culled from Protestant writers. His volumes close with a summary of the results of his inquiries.

Mr. Marshall repeatedly acknowledges the generosity of the Protestant laity, who are discouraged by no failures from throwing away millions after millions of money, in the vain but sincere hope of purchasing the services of those who may have the vocation and the ability to spread the Protestant faith among the heathen. In fact, the generosity of Exeter Hall is a lesson we should do well to learn. We can triumph over the missionary societies of Protestants,

not because we can compete with their lavish liberality, but because the gift of a true missionary vocation is not to be found among them. If they had our missionaries, they would provide for their support much more largely than we do, even in proportion to our means.

This consideration applies to Catholics throughout Europe, but more especially to English Catholics. It is somewhat humiliating to compare the amount which we contribute to the funds of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, with the amount which we receive from those funds.

Mr. Marshall teaches us how cheaply successful missions to barbarians are maintained; our own experience shows us how expensive, in proportion to their numerical results, are missions in European countries. With these lessons in one's memory, it is not pleasant to find to what an extent our English missions belong to the pauper class; to the class of those which are maintained on charity, not to those which give generously; to those which consume much, and thrive little, not to those which thrive much, and consume little. The Church in England and Scotland, and, to some degree, in Ireland, is a mendicant Church; it lives, to a certain extent, on the alms of the Church in other lands. Out of the total receipts of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith in 1860, which were 4,547,399 francs, England, Scotland, and Ireland received among them 444,700 francs; our European colonies, 35,000; our East-Indian possessions, 423,000; our African colonies, 61,500; our American colonies, 343,000; besides what was spent upon our kinsmen in the United States, and upon our Islands in the Pacific. Thus the sum of 1,307,200 francs,—nearer one-third than a quarter of the whole,—were spent upon us and upon our fellow subjects. The average sum collected by the Society (from 1856 to 1860 inclusive) is 4,917,700 francs, or 196,700*l.* a year. Of this, France contributes, on the average, 3,052,010 francs, or 122,000*l.*; while England gives 40,280 francs, or 1611*l.* England alone consumes on an average 212,240 francs, or 8490*l.* a year; and as this sum varies in proportion to the amount we contribute, the figures prove how well it pays us to be liberal. Thus self-interest and generous shame unite to urge us to make some stronger exertions to rival the liberality of our Protestant countrymen, and to respond to the generosity of our brethren in France, instead of glorifying ourselves for a triumph which is not ours. There is not in the world an organisation which can show such results, in proportion to its expenditure, as the Society for the Propagation of the Faith;

there is none which has greater claims on our gratitude or Christian charity. Yet it is most inadequately supported by us. And there is no doubt that, with a little exertion, the subscriptions which it receives from England might be nearly doubled.

W.

EDMUND CAMPION.—No. VII.

AND now, before we follow the Jesuits on their mission, it would be well to describe the religious condition of the people to whom they were sent.

In August 1580, the twenty-second year of Elizabeth's reign was drawing to a close. A generation had been born and grown to manhood since she had altered the religion of the land. In 1558, when she succeeded to the throne, she found three parties in the country; the Catholics and two others, now known by names which they only acquired some years afterwards,—the Puritans and the Politicians.

The Catholics were not a united party; some had accepted the severities of Mary as a moral lesson, and had brought themselves to think that the "frying" of a "stinking heretic" at the stake was a comforting lesson; others had become disgusted at Mary's continual perquisition into secret opinions; and the majority, wearied out, had come to the conclusion, that it would be quite possible to live at peace with the heretic, instead of driving him forth from society to prison or to the stake.

The Puritans,—to call them by a name which, Sir Robert Cotton says, was first pinned to their skirts by Father Sanders about 1570,—led by the English refugees who had come back as fanatical adherents of the Continental Calvinists, with all the narrow sectarianism and bloodthirstiness of that sect, were far behind in numbers, but they brought two doctrines with them which gave them great influence: the first, that it is the duty and the right of the prince to choose the religion of his subjects; and next, that the duty of obedience in the subject cannot be divided between a temporal and spiritual superior. *Cujus regio, ejus religio*, was the formula of the first; *uni et univoce* of the second. Calvin, Knox, and Beza, with the fear of the two Marys, of England and Scotland, before their eyes, had thought it best to except females from this sovereign right. But "regiment of women" ceased to be "monstrous" on the accession of Elizabeth; though she never forgave the Calvinists for having once

played false with the fundamental principle of Protestant politics.

The Politicians,—to use a name given to the party by the Guises of France in 1568,* and applied by Davila† to those who acknowledged no fundamental difference between one religion and another, so far as the State is concerned,—were described by Stapleton as the children whom Rachel weeps for, because they are not; not her children at all, but “false and feigned Christians, neither Christians nor Catholics, but Politicians. Polite and civil, elegant and gentleman-like, prudent and wise, turning religion into policy, and making a mock at zeal; telling us that in these days we must wink at many things, do any thing for a quiet life, not stir up hornets’ nests; that the heresies of the day are too strong to be forcibly put down, too deep-seated to be plucked out of men’s minds; that the points are too unimportant for such a display of energy; at least not important enough to oblige politicians, who are not charged with the management of religion, to endanger the peace and prosperity of the country in the attempt to repress them. The prudent statesman’s first business is to provide for the welfare of his countrymen, to accommodate himself to the pleasure of his prince, to avoid all superfluous bickering about religion, and to leave its care to the clergy or to God, who is strong enough to avenge Himself, if He feels insulted by the new opinions.”‡

These Politicians, when Elizabeth came to the throne, had a double problem to solve: first, to secure the crown to the queen; and secondly, to give peace to the country, profoundly agitated by the Spanish policy of Queen Mary. The danger to the queen came from the Pope’s definition of her bastardy; to meet this, it was necessary to disable the Pope’s authority. The danger to the country was in the discord of the adherents of the various religions; the obvious remedy for this nowadays would be toleration for all; but in 1558 such a thought was almost impossible. The unity of religion in a country was reckoned to be a State necessity. Hence, where opinions were much divided, and the national character strong and obstinate, it was not deemed possible to favour any extreme and exclusive sect, but only to enforce moderation upon all; and this, not by allowing all to differ, but by obliging them all to meet on a common and, as it were, neutral ground. For the first of these State necessities the obvious measure was to confer once more on Elizabeth the ecclesiastical supremacy which Henry VIII. had arro-

* Thuanus, lib. xlix. c. 11.

† Lib. v. ad an. 1573.

‡ Stapleton, *Sermo contra Politicos*.

gated, and Mary had abjured. For the second, the Politicians took advantage of the profound weariness of the Catholics, and of the Protestant principle which gives a prince supreme power to choose the religion of his country, to devise a new formula which might satisfy both Catholics and Puritans, by suppressing all that either considered to be blasphemy, and by including only the "fundamentals" on which both were agreed.

After the queen's accession, the Politicians, who surrounded her, began by repressing the zeal of each side, forbidding all preaching, and all disputes, till they were delivered from the fear of foreign intervention by the treaty of Cateau Cambresis in April 1559.* Then the Parliament, in default of the Convocation, passed two measures; one for conferring on the queen the supremacy, and for imposing an oath on the subject in acknowledgment of it; and the other for abolishing the Mass, and substituting for it a form of prayer, which might be used in "common" by those who believed and those who disbelieved in Catholic doctrines. The first hope of the Politicians was that the existing Catholic hierarchy might be induced to connive at the new system, as they had done in Henry and Edward's time. With this view,—in spite of the frantic appeals which the Continental Reformers kept making to Elizabeth to play the part of Judith and Deborah, and destroy the Papists root and branch, seeing that Continental experience amply proved that the preservation of the externals of Popery always in the long-run led to its reëstablishment,—the old forms that met the eye were to be altered as little as possible; the vestments were to remain, and the hierarchical constitution, and, if possible, the same pastors. No doctrinal changes were to be made, only those portions of the old liturgy,—the adoration of the blessed Sacrament, and the worship of images and saints,—which were most offensive to the new opinions were to be dropped. The foreign Protestants were furious; they declared emphatically to their English followers, that they could not possibly take any ministerial part in a Church thus constituted. The question of vestments was declared a fundamental one.† But when it was seen that the queen and government were firm, the same counsellors advised their friends to dissimulate, and to "use the habits, provided they persisted in speaking and teaching against the use of them."‡ For the great

* Grindal to Hubert, May 23, 1559,—Zurich Letters, second series, p. 19.

† Peter Martyr to Thomas Sampson, July 15, 1559,—Zurich Letters, second series, p. 25.

‡ Peter Martyr to Sampson, Feb. 1, 1560, *ib.* p. 39.

fear of the Puritans was, lest they should be personally excluded from all share in the new establishment. Their first speculation was, whether the Bishops would conform; and, between hope and fear, they consoled themselves that they would rather resign, "as being ashamed, after so much tyranny and cruelty exercised under the banner of the Pope, and the obedience so lately sworn to him, to be again brought to a recantation, and convicted of manifest perjury."* When this external obstacle was once removed, the internal obstacle of their own consciences gave the Puritans little trouble, and they gladly accepted the commission to govern a Church, the constitution of which they thought wrong, in hopes of being able in time to conform it to their notions of right.

The Bishops all refused to take the oath, and were mostly deprived of their sees before the end of 1559. The Puritan leaders were substituted for them. On May 23, 1559, a royal commission was issued to visitors, partly lay, partly clerical, and all Puritan, to tender the oath to the rest of the clergy.† They were ordered to proceed with such moderation, as not to exasperate the Catholics, but to bring them gradually, by fair means, to a sense of their duty.‡ The first commission was too zealous; and in October the queen had to modify it, substituting laymen for several of the clergymen.§ But even their moderation had such serious effects that, in December, the queen had to write to the commissioners in both provinces to suspend their proceedings, and to determine such matters only as had been already begun.|| The effect of these arrangements was, that of the multitudes of clergymen who refused to subscribe, very few were immediately deprived; some had three years given them for consideration,¶ and others seem to have been connived at. In the visitation of the province of York in August and September 1559,** out of 89 clergymen summoned, 20 came and took the oath, 36 came and refused to swear, 17 were absent without proctors, 16 were absent with proctors. Yet of the 36 the lists of Bridgewater and Sanders only contain 5 names; of the 17, 4; of the 16, 7. If those lists are perfect, it proves that the rest were connived at, and perhaps retained their livings till their

* Grindal to Hubert, May 23, 1559, *ib.* p. 19.

† Rymer, xv. pp. 518, 519.

‡ Strype, *Life of Parker*, p. 125; and Heylin, *Hist. Ref.* vol. ii. p. 174.

§ Rymer, *ib.* pp. 546, 547.

|| State-Paper Office, *Dom. Eliz.* vol. vii. no. 79.

¶ *e.g.* Stapleton and Godsalue, prebendaries of Chichester, *Dom. Eliz.* xi. no. 25.

** *Dom. Eliz.* vii. no. 79.

death. In the province of Canterbury, we hear of the dean and canons of Winchester Cathedral, the warden and fellows of the College, and the master of St. Cross, all refusing the oath.* Yet only four of them are in Bridgewater's list. The visitation of the whole province gave the totals of 49 recusants, and 786 conformists,† significantly omitting the absentees. Thus, out of the 8911 parishes,‡ and 9400 beneficed clergymen,§ we find only 806 subscribers, while all the bishops and 85 others expressly refused to subscribe, and all the rest were absentees. The assertion, then, of Camden, that only 189 clergymen were deprived in this visitation proves nothing. Archbishop Parker had orders "not to push any one to extremities on account of his oath."|| But Sanders and Bridgewater give many more names; and even their lists, as Parsons owns, were imperfect. For, as Bramhall says, the writers at Rome, Rheims, and Douay were strangers to what was passing in England. It was the interest of the government to hide from the Catholics the real number of recusants, lest they should become over-bold. No wonder, then, that the priests were often tempted to complain with Elias, in Jezebel's persecution, "I only am left," when there were really seven thousand who had not bowed to Baal.

However, what with the expirations of the three years of grace, and fresh commissions sitting from time to time, the clergy, at first connived at, were gradually removed, and their places filled up with men who were required to acknowledge the queen to be supreme head of the Church of England upon earth; while no great difficulty was raised about other points of doctrine, provided they were willing to obey the laws of the realm.¶ Thus it came to pass that most of the clergy were "popish priests, consecrated to perform Mass; and the far greater part of the remainder most ignorant persons," appointed to spell through the prayers, but not allowed to preach.** I have said that the priests who refused the oath had far fewer scruples about the common prayer. When it was first introduced under Edward, some priests said the Latin Mass, some the English Communion; some both, some neither; some said half of the one, and half of the other. "And this mingle-mangle did every man make at his pleasure, as he thought it would be most grateful to

* Dom. Eliz. June 30, 1559, vol. iv. no. 72.

† British Museum, Lansdowne Ms. cix. p. 17.

‡ Dom. Eliz., vol. cvi. no. 7.

§ Camden, Eliz. i. 32.

|| Strype, Parker, p. 125.

¶ Percival Wiburn, Report on the State of the Church of England,—Zurich Letters, second series, p. 358.

** George Withers, *ibid.* p. 163.

the people. But that which was of more importance and impiety, some did consecrate bread and wine, others did not, but would tell the people beforehand plainly that they would not consecrate, but restore them the bread and wine back again as they received it from them, only adding to it the Church-benediction. And after consecration, some did hold up the Host to be adored after the old fashion, and some did not. And of those that were present, some did kneel down and adore, others did shut their eyes, others turned their faces aside, others ran out of Church blaspheming, and crying 'Idolatry!'"* Under Elizabeth this state of things lasted with some modification. Before the service on Sunday, the priests would celebrate Mass in their own houses, and the Catholics would communicate there, while the Protestants communicated at church; or the priest would take to church the Hosts which he had consecrated at home, to give at the altar-rails to his Catholic parishioners, while he gave to the Protestants the wafers that had been used for the service in the Common Prayer-book. Thus the Sacrament of two hostile religious bodies was distributed by the same hands, at the same time, at the same altar-rails, to the discordant and divided flock.† During the Northern rebellion in 1569, the priests took occasion to restore the old service, and sang High Mass in Durham Cathedral. Among the State-Papers, there are instances of incumbents saying Mass in their houses much later; and even in 1592, we find several clergymen in one county giving large sums to a pretended pursuivant not to accuse them of Popery. It was only in 1579, in her twenty-first year, that Elizabeth felt strong enough to enforce a general obedience to the Act of Uniformity.‡

The oath of supremacy gave the queen permission to choose the religion of her subjects, and to enforce upon them the external observance of it. This, however objectionable in theory, did not seem likely to produce any immediate practical harm, as the queen was not supposed to be inclined towards the Puritans. Hence an opinion was circulated, that it gave power to the queen to minister at public worship, and to consecrate Bishops; this exaggeration was convenient, for it gave the Politicians an opportunity to publish injunctions, declaring that the supremacy meant nothing of the sort, but the same power which all the kings of England had claimed, "of sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons born

* Parsons, *Three Conversions of England*, pt. ii. c. xii. p. 206, ed. London, 1688, fol.

† Sanders de Schismate, lib. iii. p. 342, ed. Col. 1610.

‡ See State-Papers of that year, *passim*.

within these her realms, of what estate, either ecclesiastical or temporal, soever they may be." "No power of ministry was challenged;" the queen was ready to accept as good subjects those who took the oath in its merely historical sense.* Still the royal supremacy was not merely the right of the executive magistrate to see that every corporation was what it professed to be, and administered its own laws justly, and that right was done by and to every corporation, religious or secular, within its territory. For there was no freedom for corporations in those days. The prince claimed the right of authorising one, and only one, corporation, and suppressing all others. If this right had been restricted to temporal corporations, and if freedom of choice had remained for spiritual corporations, the Catholics might have been inclined to have accepted it as a compromise,† however destructive of civil liberty the law might be. Similarly, their objection was not so much to any thing contained in the Common Prayer as to its omissions; the want of papal authority,‡ prayers to the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, prayers for the dead, the seven Sacraments, and external sacrifice; they even approved of prayers in the vulgar tongue. The one thing for which they rejected communion with the Establishment was its "lack of unity," its schism from the rest of Christendom, and its want of homogeneity in itself, "some being therein Protestants, some Puritans, and some of the Family of Love."§

Yet this lack of unity—of external unity with the rest of Christendom, and of internal unity with itself—was the one sacrifice which the Politicians were determined to make, in order to secure the political unity of the country, and the unity of the State with the Church. They were not going to commit the mistake of the Electors of the Palatinate, and force all Englishmen to believe alike, and to change their belief as often as the prince changed. But they insisted that no corporation apart from the State should have the power of branding Englishmen as heretics, and subjecting them to the social and political disabilities which that brand induced. Their theory was, to let every body believe as he liked, so as he came to church; to reckon all Englishmen as Churchmen, unless formally joined to some external body, and at the same time to proscribe all such external bodies, and to make adhesion to them treason.

And as the lack of religious unity was the point which the

* Apology for the oath, in Cecil's writing, Dom. Eliz. vol. xv. no. 27, 1560 (?).

† See Feckenham, Articles confessed by him at Wisbeach, 1580, Lansdowne Ms. no. 30, art. 77.

‡ Lansdowne Ms. xxvii. art. 20. § Lansdowne Ms. no. 30, ut sup.

Politicians were bent on enforcing, so it was that least offensive to the pious, and least observable by the unreflecting clergyman. It was only a suspension of discipline, an authoritative stoppage of the persecution which had disgusted the people by its cruelty. In country parishes where the people were all Catholic, and where the forced communion with heretics was therefore a dead letter, there was positively no change but the not unpopular substitution of the English for the Latin service. It appeared to be only a toleration that must at times be practised by all establishments, when their evil members are too numerous and powerful to be severely dealt with.* Its true character only came out step by step, year by year; and its full consequences were only revealed when custom and habit, enforced by policy, and irritated by many clumsy attempts to change them, had become too strong to be conquered.

As for the people, the two things that struck them were, the cessation of the unpopular persecution, and the change of service. The latter was no great novelty to them. For thirty years they had been used to variations, some of which had been made on illegitimate authority, some, as Mary's restoration, rightfully; but all had come proximately to the people on the authority of the State, whether it was the State acting schismatically or acting in obedience to Rome. So far as appeared externally, Elizabeth's change might be as authorised as Mary's; and there was little opportunity for becoming aware of its internal character. For the communication between Englishmen in those days was slow and difficult, and the Catholic portion of the people was divided geographically from the Protestant part, which was found chiefly about London and in the southern counties, especially in the sea-ports of the west. It was only among the Protestants that the full significance of the change could be at once understood. At first it appeared a boon to both parties,—the Catholics, who were tired of the Spanish persecution carried on in their name and for their behoof, and the Protestants, to whom it brought liberty, not without hopes of retaliation. This enabled Sir Robert Cotton to say, that "until the eleventh year of Elizabeth's reign (the end of 1569) a recusant's name was scarcely known." It was scarcely known, because it was the great object of the State not to know it, not to recognise that there were any dissidents, to dissimulate differences; not because the people were converted to Protestantism, nor altogether "because the zeal begotten in the time of the Marian persecution

* S. Augustin. c. ep. Parmeniani, lib. iii. c. 2; and Dec. Can., *non potest*, 23, q. 4.

was yet fresh in memory, and the late persecutors were so amazed with the sudden alteration of religion that they could not but say, *Digitus Dei est hic.*" Far less truth is there in the Utopian picture which Cotton proceeds to paint: "In those days there was emulation between clergy and laity, and a strife arose whether of them should show themselves most affectionate to the Gospel. Ministers haunted the houses of worthiest men, where now (1623) Jesuits build their tabernacles, and poor country churches were frequented with the best of the shire; the word of God was precious, prayer and preaching went hand in hand together, until Archbishop Grindal's disgrace" (1567): the very mention of which ought to have made Cotton ashamed of giving so false a representation of the matter.* Grindal's disgrace was in consequence of his patronage of the "liberty of prophesying," that is, of the preaching of Puritan ranters, which was every where driving the Catholics—who had hitherto acquiesced in the State Church—to open hostility. Fearing this result, Elizabeth ordered the exercise of prophesying to be suppressed, the preachers to be reduced to a smaller number, and homilies to be read instead of sermons. It was not Grindal's disgrace, but the impudence of the Puritans whom he patronised, that first made recusancy formidable.

For the people, partly for the reasons I have given above, partly because they hoped the changes were only temporary, like so many they had seen, and partly through fear,—“not knowing,” as Cotton says,† quite inconsistently with his account quoted above, “how far severity might extend,”—had, in the first years of Elizabeth, sunk their differences, and attended the church, where, for the most part, their old pastors yet ministered. But soon scandals arose; tinkers and cobblers succeeded to the pulpits of the grave theologians who were dispossessed. Some of the priests forgot their vows of celibacy; and as early as 1562, during a tour in Essex and Suffolk, Elizabeth was offended at the slovenly way of performing the service, and at the consequences of clerical marriage; and on her return issued an order against all resort of women to the lodgings of cathedrals and colleges;‡ while the Catholic gentlemen were so scandalised, that they sent to consult the Council of Trent whether their attendance at the churches could be permitted. The answer was a decided negative.§ I do not know whether any immediate measures were taken to publish this decision; but in 1567, St. Pius V.

* Cottoni Posthuma, p. 149.

† p. 133.

‡ Nares, Burghley, ii. 240, 241; Strype, Ann. i. 405; and Parker, i. 212.

§ See More, Hist. Prov. Ang. Soc. Jes. lib. iii. c. 6 sqq.

sent Dr. Sanders and Dr. Harding into England, with episcopal powers to grant faculties for the absolution of schismatics, but chiefly to declare that "there was no hope of exception or dispensation for any of the laity" to have their children baptised, or themselves to be "present at the communion of service now used in churches in England."* From this time large numbers of the Catholic laymen began to refuse to go to church; and the indirect measures taken against them by the government, together with the direct pressure of St. Pius V. through Dr. Morton, who was sent into England in 1568, provoked the unfortunate rebellion of the great northern earls in 1569, which rendered hopeless any peaceable restoration of Catholicism while Elizabeth lived.

The effect of these movements was gradually to divide the English Catholics into two bands,—the temporisers, or schismatics, who kept the faith, but frequented the churches, and the open Catholics, who braved fine and imprisonment, and refused to go to church. The rebellion of 1569 showed that, on the least provocation, the schismatics were ready to join the others, and to reëstablish the old religion by force. The Politicians, who had hitherto inclined rather to the Catholic side against the Puritans, were, even before that event, forced to remember that the Church which they had created hung on the single thread of the queen's life; that on her death Mary of Scotland would succeed, and would reverse all that had been accomplished in these eleven years. They therefore appealed to all the gentry, clergy, and tradesmen who wished to preserve the existing state of things, to join in a secret society for the protection of the queen, not unlike the associations of seven years later in France for the protection of the king and the French Catholics. By the very tenor of Burghley's proposition, it is clear that the appeal was made to the Puritans, and that the Puritan members of the Government no longer put forward the comprehensive character of the Church, but its exclusiveness, as its claim to their support. "No monarchy is so established by laws in good policy to remain in freedom from the tyranny of Rome, and in constancy and conformity of true doctrine, as England is. Wherein no person, of any state, is by law admitted to profess openly the contrary without punishment provided for the same by good

* Letter of Laurence Vaux, Dom Eliz. vol. xli. art. 1. see Collier, vol. vi. p. 458, ed. 1840. He and Bishop Kennett (Lansdowne Ms. no. 951, p. 118) say that the faculties were granted Aug. 14. 1567. The latter refers to Sutcliffe's answer to Parsons. Sutcliffe, in his Challenge to Parsons, p. 181, talks of "faculties granted to Thomas Harding *about* the year 1567." These faculties were, however, given in 1566, for the letter of Vaux referring to them is dated Nov. 1st, in that year.

order of laws; and such like, for the policy to all purposes, is not to be found in Christendom."* Thus appealed to, the Puritans began a secret organisation, under the guidance of the Puritan members of the Privy Council, and were industrious in enrolling members. By 1578 the French ambassador had found it out, and wrote to his court that the Puritans were busy associating, and binding themselves by oath to extirpate the Catholic religion. This organisation ripened into the famous Society for the Preservation of the Queen, which makes a figure in the history of 1584. The religious questions at this date resolved themselves into a race for the favour of the queen.

The Catholics, apparently under the inspiration of the French ambassador, and after the example of the French societies of 1576, began in that very year to make a "combination,"† in which we find such names as the Earl of Northumberland, the Earl of Oxford, Lord Henry Howard, Charles Arundell, Giffard, and Jerningham. Their object apparently was to promote the queen's marriage with the Duke of Anjou, which the Puritans as resolutely opposed. Except for the tragic end of the drama, the varieties of its progress are a complete comedy. There were the Puritans, furious against the match; there was the Spanish ambassador, striving to persuade the Catholics to oppose it likewise; there was the French ambassador, jaunty and gay, surrounded with his "combination," or chorus of Catholic courtiers, whom he exhorted to be patient, for the end would crown the labour, and the queen's new husband would secure their freedom of worship. There were the counsellors: the mysterious Burghley, in whom the world discovered a Solon, while Shakespeare more truly painted him as Polonius; the profound and Mephistophelian Walsingham; the versatile, handsome, and unprincipled Leicester; and the rest,—whom the French ambassador persuaded himself that he was persuading to be sworn slaves of his master, in direct contradiction to their own interests. Lastly, there was the audacious queen, giving hopes to all, but satisfying none; faithful to her policy of doing little, but letting events work themselves out, and making it her main business to preserve her personal popularity. The French ambassador was blinded with

* 7 June 1569, Dom. Eliz. vol. li. nos. 6 and 7. The exclusiveness and intolerance of the English State Church, when once transformed by the Puritans, became their great boast: "Nay, the Pope doth openly tolerate Jews and Marrans, which blaspheme the name of Christ; which wickedness shall not be found in us." Sutcliffe, *Answer to Owlyglasse's Exceptions to his Challenge*, p. 202.

† Dom. Eliz. vol. cli. no. 39. The date of the paper is 1581, and it refers to five years before.

the good cheer of England, where there was talk of nothing but gallantry; and with the queen's progresses in the shires, where she gained all hearts, and where the wealthy gentry worshiped her on their knees. So far was she from preferring the Puritans, that many of her prime personal favourites were as near being Catholics as the irregularities of their lives would permit. Thus, Hatton, as Allen tells us, was one who had no doubt about the Catholic religion being true.* She made no objection to the religion of Anjou; indeed, she said that his fidelity to it was a claim on her respect; and in 1578 she agreed with the French ambassador that her husband was to be allowed to do as he liked in his own house, as she hoped to be allowed to do as she liked in hers;† and she told Leicester, a mortal enemy of the match, that "this was the year to marry off all the poor old maids in England; they should all be wedded with her." But nothing could make her act; she delayed, and the opponents of the match took the occasion to whisper that Anjou was dwarfish, bandy, pock-pitted, with bad breath, plenty of ambition, and more bigotry. He would be sure to establish the Catholic religion. Walsingham was sent over, confidentially, to look at the duke, and to report on these matters; he reassured the queen, who professed herself satisfied. Nevertheless the affair dragged on. In May 1579, the Earl of Huntingdon, a pretender to the crown, and the chief of the Puritan party, declared that the marriage would be the ruin of England and of the religion, and set on some ministers to preach in this sense. Elizabeth, with characteristic brevity, threatened to have them whipped. She took care to display an increasing coolness for the Common Prayer; and when she was conversing with Castelnau on her lover's charms, she could not tear herself away even when the chapel-bell rang. Burghley shook his head when he reflected how easy it would be to upset the established religion, considering the stake owned by Catholics in the land, the secret favour of the queen towards them, and her deafness to all whispers against them.‡ But nothing progressed, except the hopes of Castelnau. Many of the Catholic allies of the French ambassador were tired out; they were disgusted with Anjou's conduct, and ceased to trust in the queen's intentions to marry him, and so turned to the Spanish ambassador,§ who was glad of their assistance

* *Responsio ad Edict. Reg. Ang.* p. 21.

† Castelnau-Mauvissière, Despatch from London to Henry III. at Paris, Sept. 8, 1578, Ms. Imperial Library, Paris.

‡ Despatch of May 29, 1579.

§ The following speech is attributed by the Earl of Oxford to Charles Arundell, in the latter part of 1579 or 1580: "There was neither personage,

in discountenancing the match.* This laid the foundation of a split among the Catholics, and a counter-combination was set up, with the countenance of the Spanish ambassador. Those who remained faithful to the French were obliged to persuade themselves that the marriage would come off, and would at once heal all their afflictions. Therefore, every thing that helped on the match, however calamitous for the moment to the Catholic religion, was ultimately for its benefit. They must not let it be thought that Anjou was a bigoted Papist, or the Puritans would never acquiesce in the match; his agents must therefore, for the present, abstain from using their influence in favour of the oppressed Catholics; only a little patience, a little more suffering under the atrocious penal laws, and all would be over; Anjou would be king, and would soon lay the axe to the root of the tree. Only let the Catholics dissimulate a little longer, and shut their eyes to the daily tragedies of their brethren, and the new state of things for which these tragedies would smooth the way would be the remedy for them all. The Spanish ambassador had no such political reasons for dissimulation, and could afford to call a spade a spade. Round him, then, gathered the generous Catholic youth, who were prepared for any sacrifice, who were tired of waiting on the caprices of a woman, and who were resolved henceforth to dissimulate nothing. Yet the necessities of the times compelled them to adopt a secret organisation, and they thus gave birth to a curious monster,—a secret society which could not remain secret, the first duty of its members being to absent themselves from services which the law bade them attend. To them it would have been useless to have “the receipt of fern-seed,—to walk invisible,” for their invisibility at church was the first overt act of their “sedition.” Theirs was a secret society whose object was to make secret believers into open professors; a secret society to destroy secrecy. They had given up the race to get the start in the favour of the prince; the Puritans had won, and now, *væ victis*. No “courtesy, humanity, or reasonable indifference,” could be had from such ignoble conquerors. Catholics were shut out from “speech, conference, religion, wit, or constancy” in Anjou; Arundell “had long given up that course, and taken another way,—which was to Spain,”—ever since the Lord Chamberlain had by his own obstinacy missed the opportunity of disgracing for ever the enemies of the match, whereby the French agent Semier was “so discouraged as never after he had mind to strain any longer, reputing the whole cause then to be overthrown.” Arundell had “made an end of Anjou’s cause, and liked it no more; but spoke of the Spanish king’s piety, greatness, and wealth,” and prophesied that he would be monarch of the world. Dom. Eliz. vol. eli. no. 39.

* Despatch of July 26, 1579.

writing, disputing, or any other fair trial of their cause ;" they were watched, spied, examined every where ; attached, transported, imprisoned, racked, or hanged, if they spoke or argued.

Still a section, hoping against hope, adhered to the French ambassador. In July 1579, Elizabeth imprisoned a preacher for talking against foreign alliances and mixed marriages. This raised their hopes, only to be immediately dashed by one of those occurrences which were always a pretext for fresh delays. Fitzmorris, with a company of Bretons, made a descent on Ireland, and occupied Limerick. The Spanish ambassador loudly accused Henry III. of France as an accomplice of the wild Irishman ; while Castelnau declared it was a plot of Philip II. to stop the match, and that he had condescended even to conspire with the Calvinists against it. At the same time (Oct. 1579), he declared that the queen's better treatment of the Catholics had won back many of them from the Spanish interests. He noted the ever-increasing fury of the Puritans, their petitions to parliament, the way they worked on the fears of the "timid" queen, and their declaration that Anjou would soon have a St. Bartholomew's Day in England. He enlarged on Stubbs's pamphlet, "The Gulph wherein England will be swallowed by the Marriage ;" the fury of the queen, who wanted him hanged, her disappointment when the jury would not find him guilty of felony, the disgrace of the judge, the interest that was made to have Stubbs pardoned, and Elizabeth's final command to have the sentence (loss of his right hand) executed upon him before her window at eight o'clock one morning. Leicester and Walsingham, with the rest of the Puritans, were in disgrace ; Elizabeth was furious ; and Anjou was foolish enough to direct Castelnau to intercede for them. They swore fidelity to the French interests ; and he accordingly reconciled them to the queen. This was in obedience to the duke's instructions, "to accept every one's service, and not to keep any one in disgrace on his account." "I think," says Castelnau, with a simplicity wonderful in so old a courtier, "that from this time Leicester will seek to maintain himself by the aid of France." However, Leicester, Walsingham, Huntingdon, and Pembroke, soon used their restored power in exactly the opposite direction ; and, February 8, 1580, Castelnau was obliged to confess that the queen's ill-humour and cruelty to the mislikers of the match had alienated from her (or it) a great part of her nobles and people, and obliged her to ask a further delay, and that she had given too much credit to those whom she had just restored to power.

Thus did these negotiations drag on; Castelnau's cleverness ever overreached by his vanity, which made him believe in victory when he had only fallen into a trap. But Solomon himself could not have succeeded. Elizabeth had once possessed power to change the religion of England; but to this end she had been obliged to arm the Puritans and disarm the Catholics, and now the Puritans were too powerful to be overcome. Even if the Catholics had succeeded in making Elizabeth marry Anjou, I doubt whether it would have done much more for the Catholics than the marriage of Charles with Henrietta forty years later. But the Puritans were determined not to risk the change if they could help it, and so much the more as they saw the Catholics desirous of it. On July 5, 1580, Castelnau writes, "The Puritans fear that if the queen is married, the Catholics will soon get the upper hand; and suppose that she has a great fancy for them, because she treats them more mildly than she has done for twenty years. And, indeed, the number of Catholics has much increased, and they have raised their heads a little too soon, and built too much on the hopes of the marriage."

It was just at this time that Campion and Parsons were coming into England. Their arrival was another of those events to which Castelnau attributed his want of success. About the same time also Condé came over to complain to Elizabeth of the treatment of the French Protestants by Henry III. Elizabeth refused to continue the negotiations for the marriage till Henry had made peace with them. Henry of course refused to forego the advantages he had gained.* Elizabeth replied by complaining of a visit of the Earl of Westmoreland to Paris, of Dr. Allen's seminary at Rheims, and of the fifty priests just sent over to preach sedition. This, said she, was the reason of her temporising. Henry retorted, that Elizabeth had received Condé, whom he asked her to send away; and there seemed every element of a diplomatic quarrel, when suddenly there came news to London of the defection of some of the queen's most powerful Irish friends. Castelnau considered the government in great danger. "I believe," he wrote, "that if monarchs will be obstinate in their civil wars, subjects will not be without pretexts for casting off their allegiance."† In the following despatches, August 13 and 30, he describes the severe measures that the council thought of taking against the Catholics. In September, the queen heard of the landing of the joint Span-

* Pinard, *Dépêche à Mauvissière*, Paris, Bib. Imp. Ancien Fonds, no. 8810. Despatch of July 10, 1580.

† August 8, 1580.

ish and Papal expedition in Ireland. The danger was great, and so was the terror. She implored Henry to send at once an army into the Low Countries, otherwise this would only be the forerunner of many expeditions. In November the Irish bubble burst; and Castelnau told his master that "the Spaniards and Italians behaved like great poltroons, and had their throats cut. Lord Grey, the viceroy, had all the Irish hanged, except a priest, who was to be sent into England, and Dr. Sanders, a great preacher, and too good a theologian to fight. The expedition was magnificently provided, but it would have been better if they had been furnished with less money and more manfulness."

I quote these passages to show what were the peculiar complications of the time when the mission of the Jesuits began in England. But I will not proceed with Campion's history till I have briefly reviewed the position of the Anglican clergy, and of the common people.

The members of the Puritan hierarchy intruded into the English sees in 1569 and 1560 had accepted a position which they did not approve. They were all Calvinists, except Cheney of Gloucester, who was a Lutheran; the vast majority of the clergy was Catholic, and hardly yet recognised its schismatical position. The queen would allow no further innovations in the externals of religion, but was incurious about doctrine; hence the new Bishops were able to get in their wedge of Calvinistic intolerance in the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, the bulwark against retrogression towards Rome, and against such a development of the truths still left in the Prayer-Book as should necessitate the restoration of those which had been dropped. These articles were intended to narrow the comprehensive character of the Church by providing that all the new clergy should be Calvinist. Next, the Bishops gave an extraordinary latitude to the "liberty of prophesying," which might have developed the establishment into a Genevan conventicle, had not Elizabeth interposed with her veto. Many of the Politicians, convinced that the Catholic party would restore the Papal supremacy and the exclusiveness of the Church the first day they had the power, had now turned to the Puritans. Not that they had any intention of submitting to the Genevan discipline; but they were willing to allow it so far as the suppression of the bishoprics and cathedrals, and the confiscation of their goods. Again, the ignorant low-bred Calvinists were easier to exclude from all share in government than the highly-educated Roman ecclesiastic, or the Anglican who had succeeded to the inheritance of the English universities.

Hence "they sought to disgrace the clergy," scarcely admitting them to matters of state at all, "contrary to the practice of all well-governed commonwealths, and of our own till these late years."*

But Elizabeth disgraced Archbishop Grindal, the leader of the Puritan party, and began to advance the men to whom the gradual development of Anglicanism is due. They had to conciliate the forms of a Catholic hierarchy, and of a Catholic but mutilated prayer-book, with Puritan articles of faith. They had at once to defend conservatism and revolution, to derive their authority from the old Church, and to claim a right for the State to modify the doctrines of that Church without thereby destroying its essence. They had to make the comprehensive political *via media* of 1559 into an eternal and exclusive principle of truth; as if the truth, which may perhaps be the middle point between all possible errors, can be determined by taking two presumed errors which happened to coexist in 1559, and by assuming for all time that the middle point between them is the truth. This *via media* was at first a sort of indefinite precinct, shutting off two extreme opinions, but enclosing all between them; it was afterwards turned into a religious theory, and petrified into a sham principle. It was originally an abasement of the Church before a supposititious public opinion, for the convenience of statesmen. It would have been a recognition of the supremacy of the mob if the real opinions of the people had been such as they were said to be. But the State made the Church Anglican in pretended deference to the feelings of a people who were chiefly Catholic, and partly Puritan. These sections refused to be amalgamated. The Puritans would not receive the teaching of Bishops who wore surplices. The Catholics, whose priests and schoolmasters were driven away or hanged, stood aloof, and would listen to no one else. For three or four generations their descendants preserved "the perfume of Rome," as Cotton says, and afterwards were gradually assimilated to the surrounding population, still, however, retaining a traditional hostility to the State Church.

The English hierarchy, thus cut off from both the Catholic and Puritan sections of the people, but retaining all the aristocratic influence that their feudal possessions gave them, were from the first the clergy of the rich, not the clergy of the poor. They were gentlemen, learned men, lords; but not apostles or saints. Their wealthy leisure, combined with

* Geo. Cranmer, letter to Hooker, Feb. 1598,—Keble's Hooker, vol. ii. p. 606.

their professional tastes, enabled them to preserve, what circumstances have led both Catholics and Puritans to neglect, the artistic and literary beauty of the liturgical language. When Christianity was the business of life, and time was no consideration, prayers might be as difficult as a chorus of *Æschylus*, or a sonnet of Dante. But when religion became not so much the occupation as the qualification of life, when less time was given to the direct exercises of devotion, the old enigmas were felt to be too hard. The breviary services were too long, the psalms too difficult. A new style of prayer was wanted, arranged in the most logical order, interrupted by rubrics, to tell us where to elicit one kind of act, and where another, and with language most simple and plain-spoken. The Jesuits saw what was wanted, and provided it; the Puritans felt that some change was wanted, and offered their ranting preaching and their *extempore* prayers as the solution of the difficulty. The Anglican hierarchy alone,—not pressed for time, not overburdened with “acts” and “aspirations”—kept up the old intellectual interest in the services, and popularised the psalms and the devotional use of the Old and New Testaments, not perhaps to any great extent, but more widely than has been done by other hierarchies or sects. And it was this literary exclusiveness that made them call those popularisers of devotion, the Jesuits, “the Puritans of Popery.”

To turn now from the Anglican clergy to the English people, who were so profoundly alienated from them, whose state I shall only touch upon so far as it affected the mission of Campion. All the Catholic part of the population had been surprised into the change of religion. No choice was given to them: they saw the service changed; but they saw also that no measures were taken to make them change their faith. They saw, for the most part, their pastors retaining their benefices, sometimes indeed displaced to make room for an ignorant ranter; but then, in turn, they saw this ranter’s mouth stopped, and himself reduced to a mere reader of prayers and homilies. The people bore this patiently, because it brought calm after the troubles and persecutions of Mary’s time, and because they hoped it would in its turn soon come to an end. In the mean time they might enjoy the holiday which the collapse of discipline had sent them, ready to reënter the vineyard, and work, as soon as they were called. Throughout the country and small towns, where the strength of the Catholic party was to be found, the people formed two political classes—the gentry or nobility, and the commonalty. Both classes still maintained the feudal feel-

ings; still the chief nobleman in every shire desired to see all the gentry of his county wear his livery, and acknowledge themselves his servants; while the gentry maintained the same feudal relations with the husbandmen and cottagers who lived on the family estate. The power of England had, up to the time of Henry VII., been in the hands of these nobles and gentry, who were not yet conscious that they had lost it. The overwhelming strength of the earl in his own county looked like universal power, till the fate of the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, and of the Duke of Norfolk, showed how weak the local centres had become in comparison to the combining force of the royal centralisation in London. But this lesson was not enough. It was still every where believed that rank was power; that the queen was able by a word to restore every thing as it had been; and that if she would not speak this word, the nobles and gentry might unite and dethrone her. Failing this, at least so many of the gentry might declare their adherence to the old religion as to extort a toleration, if not from her compassion, at least from her fears, as not knowing what this persecuted class might do in case of foreign invasion. In this argument the populace counted for nothing. It was taken for granted that they would follow wherever they were led, and they were treated almost as if they were incapable of intelligent conviction in matters of faith.

The great fact of the day was the power of the governor to change the belief of his subjects. By means of this fact Luther had succeeded in Germany, and Henry VIII. in England. The Jesuits quickly comprehended the state of affairs, and by similar means wrought a vast restoration of religion in Germany and in France. The same system was to be applied to England; and if Elizabeth could not be made its instrument, her bastardy gave a famous opportunity to the Pope to exert the deposing power, and to give her crown to a more faithful child of the Church. Such was the policy of Pius V. and of Gregory XIII., who sent Campion and Parsons into England. Such also was Parsons' private opinion, as may be seen from Campion's reply to one of his letters in a former chapter. But they were not sent to England to carry out this policy; they were not supposed to know any thing about it; they were only to convert the nobility and gentry to the Church, and await the consequences.

The people to whom they were sent had no settled conviction against the truth of Catholicism; their inclinations led them towards it, only their fear or their indolence prevented their profession of it. Their external show of Protestantism

was rather cowardice and sloth than heresy, rather a helplessness than a strong passion. It was their will that had to be strengthened, rather than their mind to be enlightened. Hence the absence in those days of any depth of intellectual discussion. The arguments were addressed to the heart of the people, or to their terror. *Fugienda imprimis controversia*, said Father le Fèvre to Father Laynez about the reduction of the first Lutherans. First their affections must be cured, then their faith; the way to their head is through their heart. Persuade them to be moral, and they will soon be Catholics. They are heretics because they despair of being able to live as Catholics; strengthen them to do their duty, and they will naturally come back to the faith they learnt at their mothers' knees. The English might be warned that acquiescence in the State religion was no such security as they fancied. The queen would die some day, and her successor would restore all; perhaps the Pope and the French and Spanish kings would come and dethrone her, and extirpate the heretics. Even in 1623, the people were still "timorous through forecasting the restoration of Popery;" and to this day the saying survives among them,—“the Catholic religion was the first, and shall be the last.” Thus they were always looking out for a sign of its return. A flood, or a comet, or a monstrous birth, sent a thrill through England, and awakened the expectation of the “golden day” that was to restore the old religion. No picture of those times is complete that does not catalogue these prodigies, which had so extraordinary an effect on the belief of the people. On the day of the election of St. Pius V., Maffei tells us,* a comet, like blood, stood over London, and near its tail a hand issued from a cloud, and brandished a sword. 1580 (the year the Jesuits entered the country) was distinguished by a profusion of such portents. Father Parsons, in his life of Campion, recites from Stowe,† April 2d, an earthquake in London, which made the great bell of Westminster toll of itself, and threw down portions of the Temple Church, and of Christ Church, Newgate Street, at sermon-time, and slew two persons. In June great storms of thunder and hail. One Alice Perin, eighty years of age, brought forth a monster with a head like a helmet, a face like a man, a mouth like a mouse, a human body, eight legs, all different, and a tail half a yard long. Agnes, the wife of Mr. — (Father Parsons leaves the name blank; it is scarcely worth while to refer to Stowe to restore it), gave birth to a monster that was male and

* p. 47.

† Chron., ed. 1580. The passages are suppressed in the ed. of 1592.

female, with mouth and eyes like a lion. On May 18th, a vision of a hostile fleet was seen at sea off Bodmin; a pack of hounds was heard and seen in the air in Wiltshire; and in Somersetshire three several companies of sixty men in black appeared in the air, one after another. At a time when a student of magic occupied the imperial throne, and when Lord Burghley was entreating Kelly, the quack conjurer, not to deprive his native country of the good gifts God had given him, it is not to be wondered at if such predictions as may now be seen in Moore's Almanack had a vast effect on men's minds. The old priests still occasionally warned their flocks of their evil state. A Lincolnshire boor informed the council how Parson Britton, minister of Bonnington, preached that there was no salvation for those who went without confession and penance. "You must confess," he said, "not to bad fellows like me; but if you seek for them, there be honest men in the country." The boor accordingly sought, and found an honest man, who persuaded him that "there would be amendment this year (1580) of religion," and showed him in a book the cabalistic words, "E shall fall, and I shall stand instead; and I is not J, and shall not continue; and there shall be a musing Midsummer, a murdering Michaelmas, a bloody March. All after merry shall be."* One instance is as good as twenty of the sort of sayings that were current among the people in reference to the immediate restoration of the old faith. It was needful to persuade them that it would be so; they were quite willing that it should be.

Such were the people to whom the Jesuits were sent, to bid them separate themselves from the communion of the heretics, and to forbear going to their churches, whatever the penal consequences might be. They came to separate what the queen wanted to unite, and accordingly she issued her proclamations, warning the people against them as enemies of herself, and of Church and State, who were to be diligently sought for as persons perilous to the public weal. Yet when they came, they were found to be men of peace, churchmen without weapons, teaching the old doctrine, fasting and praying, preaching confession and restitution, and offering to dispute about these points with the new ministers, whose lives were known to be far distant from any of these things. How they prospered with this people, I shall have to tell in the future chapters of this life.

* Dom. Eliz. vol. cxliv. art. 48, Dec. 12, 1580.

Correspondence.

PHYSICAL AND MORAL SCIENCES IN RELATION TO RELIGION.

SIR,—An opinion is expressed in an article in the *Rambler* for September, p. 300, which may be accurate enough, though it sounds strange to persons who watch the progress of controversy mainly or exclusively in England. You say that the physical sciences, “when directed against religion, have not the same force as the sciences which are connected with her origin, her history, and her doctrine,”—that is, as the moral sciences.

I suppose that by “religion” you mean the Catholic faith and discipline, otherwise your assertion approaches a mere truism. For the moral sciences can scarcely be directed against religion itself, only against some particular forms of it. Atheism in history, politics, or morals is impossible when those sciences are studied in their proper method; but the physical sciences are in themselves atheistic, for they cease to be physical, and become moral, when they are directed to the proof of a God, or derived from His supernatural acts. Physical sciences in themselves are of no religion at all; moral sciences, even when atheistically pursued, become religious in their way; for even atheism may be made into a dogma, and may become the parent of a whole scheme of morals. Moral sciences, then, are never directed to the annihilation of religion, but only to its perversion or change. Physical sciences, when directed against religion, only attack it accidentally,—in its points of asserted contact with the world of phenomena. But here they wage a war of extermination; they deny the reality of the contact; they account for the phenomena which religion claims as her own upon merely physical laws, and they thus introduce and encourage the suspicion that the claims of religion are due only to the imagination of the pious, or to the imposture of the cheat.

Now this seems to me to be the special form of anti-religious controversy at the present day: it is not in favour of any religion, but against all forms of faith. It strives to make faith forgotten, and to supplant the supernatural by the natural world.* And where these tactics have not succeeded, still, as you own, moral science has assumed something of the indifference of natural philosophy. It strives to have no abstract preference for one rather than another conclusion; it has no final cause out of itself; it strives for truth in its own order, and for that alone. By these means even moral sciences may be bleached from all religious hues almost as perfectly as the physical sciences; and the historical inquiry into the development of law, or of society, or of the moral code, or of politics, need

* Dr. Newman has drawn an admirable picture of this “form of infidelity of the day” in the eighth of his *Lectures on University Subjects*, 1859.

no more refer to the existence of a God than the history of physiological or physical developments in the progressive changes of the earth's crust, or the successive appearances of new species in its *fauna*. In fact, many of those sciences hitherto called moral, such as philology, have in the hands of the followers of the new method assumed the aspect of physical sciences. Philologists have shown that the question of the origin of languages may be studied in the development of grammar and vocabularies with as great freedom from all religious or moral interferences as physiologists exhibit when they trace the origin of life through the development of the ovum, or naturalists when they attempt to reach the one great central force of the universe through the correlation of physical forces.

But when physical science, or the moral sciences in their physical method of treatment, do impinge upon religion, the result is much more decisive than when moral science, in its old form, contradicts religion. In the latter case the opposition was always rather rhetorical than logical, and, like all rhetorical commonplaces, might be turned to prove either the affirmative or negative by an adroit reasoner. Physical science, on the contrary, when it does smash any religious opinion, smashes it hopelessly and entirely; and the only resource of religion is to deny its former self, and to retire to another position. It is true that physical science can only attack religion in those points where religion has mixed herself up with natural phenomena; but the number of such points is very considerable. In our own day how many such have been invaded by physical science? I was taught, as part of the doctrine of creation, that God made the world about 6000 years ago; that He made it in six days; that at first there was no death upon the earth; that lions ate straw like oxen, till Adam fell, when beast began to prey upon beast, bloodshed began, and has followed to this time. That after some centuries God drowned the whole earth with a deluge, and only saved alive the family of Noah, so that all history of the present human race begins from that patriarch. Moreover, I was taught that the Deluge was the effect of the first rain, that previously there had been only mists, and that Noah saw the first rainbow when he emerged from the ark. Though religion has survived the rude shocks she received in the destruction or weakening of all these opinions, it would be nonsense to say that she has suffered no losses in the conflict.

But perhaps you will deny that religion has the right to be mixed up with any questions which are within the province of the physical philosopher. I am not disposed to quarrel with this position. I only assert that religion as it exists in the world has not yet come to this state of freedom. The inveterate practice of eighteen centuries at least has bound it up with certain views of Scripture, with certain interpretations of Moses and Josue and David, common to the Christians of Rome, Moscow, and London. If religion was purged of all these points of contact with physical science, the natural sciences would scarcely ever be able to reach religion, except when

they were in combination with the moral and metaphysical sciences. The real questions then would not be about Moses or Josue, but about creation, about the existence of a spiritual world, about the unity of mankind. Still, though the substance of religion should be defecated from all points of contact with matter and physics, yet its evidences must still remain in the sphere of phenomena, which is also the sphere of natural science. Natural science will always claim the right of discussing how far the miracles of Christianity were really miracles, or how far the physical anticipations or scientific prophecies of Moses are confirmed* by the physical sciences. Physical science will always have something to say about the *fact* of a revelation so far as it depends on physical evidences. Historical science discusses the same *fact* so far as it depends on historical evidences. Metaphysics and morals go a step farther, and inquire whether the asserted revelations are or are not possible; whether they are in conformity with themselves, and with the fundamental principles of conscience and intelligence.

I have said that physical science makes no account of God, and is therefore atheistic, not by denying Him, but by ignoring Him. In the same way it puts aside the human soul. Physical science is materialistic, not necessarily by denying, but by being obliged to forget the human soul. The soul is a free cause. The contrary object of physical science is to do away with all free causes, especially intermediate ones; she may put up with a free Creator at the end of the infinite chain of natural causation, because she knows well that she will never get to that end, or be brought face to face with a power which can be bound by no necessary law emanating from a higher cause; but the soul of man may intervene in every link of the chain; and therefore physical science has a greater grudge against man's spiritual liberty than against the freedom of the Creator. Hence physiology has undertaken the task of proving that man's intelligence is only a development of the intelligence of brutes, and that the boundaries between the lowest specimens of human intelligence and the highest examples of brutal instinct are evanescent, and, indeed, that man's brain naturally descends from that of apes by an evolution which is universal in the animal world, and which gradually produces new species of living creatures out of older ones. The Cardinal, in the discourse which you review, makes very great concessions to this principle. He says: "Let any number of new hideous apes be found in Africa, and hailed as a more remote progenitor by enlightened naturalists, I will be satisfied to end my genealogy at *the first of the line* endowed with reason, instead of pursuing it into the primevalness of ferocity." As much as to say, Let us grant that man physically descends from apes; yet the first in the series that received the new gift of reason is our Adam, our first man, our real first father: the apes from which he was descended are no more our ancestors than the atoms of dust out of which, on the supposition hitherto current among Christians, Adam's body was formed by God, have a title to a place

in our genealogy. This admission seems to me like breaking a hole in a dike. It will be difficult to stop the flood of consequences.

And not only does physical science in its essence refuse all place to God and soul, but it also adopts methods which are totally inapplicable to any theological or moral science. And yet one great characteristic of the present day is the attempt to make this application. Look at the statistical history of Mr. Buckle: who does not feel that if his method is once admitted, his conclusion follows as a matter of course? I remember that you proved, to my mind conclusively, when you reviewed his first volume, that it was impossible to consider free acts statistically; that the abstraction of their freedom was the first step in dressing them up and preparing them for a statistical induction. I should like to know whether, in your opinion, this statistical mode of treating history as a necessary series of psychological effects of material and psychological causes is or is not growing. Among the reviews of Mr. Buckle I have seen scarcely any intelligent protests against his method, but only against his individual conclusions. Whereas, if his method is right, his conclusions are indisputable.

My reasons, then, for considering physical science as the present great enemy of religion are,—First, that it directly contradicts many opinions concerning the nature and history of the world, which have been hitherto intimately bound up with religion.

Secondly, that it necessarily ignores God and the soul; it has nothing to do with them directly; all considerations of them must be abstracted from the propositions which are submitted to its methods.

Thirdly, that a very strong tendency to introduce these physical, materialist, Baconian methods into moral science exists among historians and moral philosophers, and that the result of this introduction must be to banish God and the soul from moral science, which is their proper sphere, as well as from physical science, where, except indirectly, they have no special place.

On the other hand it is quite clear that where the controversy is not between religion and atheism, but between one form of religion and another, the arguments must all be drawn from the moral sciences. The contempt of physical science for all forms of religion is quite impartial; it has no favourites; it knows no more of Mormonism than of Catholicism. Hence objections to the Church from natural science are made only in the name of unbelief; objections gathered from historical and moral sciences are the basis of Protestantism and of every heresy and false religion. Hence, too, the Church has allies while fighting against the natural philosopher; for all religions are equally interested in her victory. But when fighting against another religion, she has no allies; all sects are naturally glad to see their great rival humiliated; and if it is done only with moral weapons, it does not seem to them that religion and morality really suffer by the conflict. Neither must it be supposed that the progress of the age has been confined to physical science, or that

the only tendency in existence is that of assimilating the method of moral sciences to that of physical ones. Apart from, and in contradiction to, this tendency, the sciences of history, of language, and of jurisprudence have received quite a new form in our age. In the accumulation, criticism, and arrangement of materials, and in the method of conducting the argument, these sciences are positively new. There is as great a difference between history now and history in Gibbon's time, as between the astronomies of professors before and after the time of Copernicus.

Hence it seems to me that persons will estimate the force of objections against Catholicity and Christianity derived from physical sciences, as compared with those derived from moral sciences, by the scale of their previous opinion as to the kind of danger which now chiefly besets the Catholic Christian. Is his temptation more towards an aberration in the direction of some degrading superstition, like Mormonism, or some fanaticism, like Methodism or Puritanism, or towards scepticism, materialism, and infidelity? If the latter, his difficulties probably come from the side of physical science; if the former, from that of the moral sciences. It seems to me, however, that a person or an academy that wishes either to understand, or, in a measure, to control, the current of religious thought must determine to study with some impartiality both branches of modern science in their relation with religion.

D. N.

COLONIES.

SIR,—The recent publication of Mr. Marshall and Mr. Goldwin Smith's letter suggest many considerations on our Colonial Empire, and lead us to inquire into the religious character of our colonial system.

First, we may assume (as part of the divine economy which appears in the whole history of religion) that the conquest of the world by the Christian powers is the preliminary step to its conversion. In paganism and in heresy there is a national and political character which identifies the religion with the nation, and requires for it the support of the State. The religion is the life of the State, and the pride of the people. The whole system of government, the whole condition of society, the literature, the cultivation, and the language are penetrated by it.

Here the Church cannot at once find entrance. If the nation is civilised, the national religion must first have lost its strength, the national faith must first be weakened, and a longing for something new must first be awakened. But if the race is degenerate, something must be done to elevate and to prepare it for the Church. For the Church cannot triumph either over a finished civilisation or over an extreme barbarism.

In the Roman world the nationality of religion had been de-

stroyed, and paganism had been exhausted in order to make way for Christ. Where this change had not been wrought, and where the national heathen system still remained undecayed, Christianity was quickly extirpated. The conversion of the Germans resembled that of the Romans: their states were broken up, and their local traditions destroyed, and they were converted in the very moment of migration and settlement.*

It is hard to conceive how the rest of the Pagan world is to be converted otherwise. The same means is still requisite to prepare the two extremes of barbarism and cultivation for the reception of Christianity—conquest by European powers. This alone can destroy the tenacity of old institutions, of social divisions, of moral customs, of political habits. By this alone can the benefit of a higher civilisation be conferred on the savage races.

The Church, whose cradle was a universal empire, has ever retained and cherished the idea of the political union of mankind. This idea was revived after the fall of the Western and the decline of the Eastern empire, in the creation of Charlemagne, and again in the Crusades, as they were planned by Hildebrand, and in the division of the world by a meridian at the commencement of the Asiatic and American empires of Portugal and Spain. But the idea has been brought nearer to fulfilment by colonisation than it could ever be by conquest.

The colonies of Spain and of England are the two great instruments by which the idea has been partially realised; between these two sets of colonies there is this great providential contrast, that one deals more with the lower, the other with the higher races. The Spaniards have been brought into contact chiefly with barbarous races that required to receive Christianity in the shape of civilisation; the English with races in which conversion had to be preceded by partial destruction, in which insurmountable obstacles to conversion subsisted in the forms of social life, and in which the pioneer of the Church was the soldier, and not the missionary.

In the former case Catholicism alone can avail. In the latter it is not requisite at first. It is indifferent what the religion of the destroyer be, provided he is animated with the common ideas of Christian civilisation. But the Church alone can undertake the spiritual care of the savage, and protect him against the rapacity of the invader. For she is not the Church of the invader alone, she belongs to both, and has duties toward both; the conversion of the heathen is as much her business as the preservation of the faithful. She does not allow the natives to be oppressed; she does not even allow them to be neglected or ignored. She also differs from Protestantism in her influence on the State, on its laws, and on the clergy; and she has in her provincial councils the means of legislating for the good of the savage natives.

All these are peculiar advantages when the civilised European

* In Saxony the absence of migration was made up for by wars of extermination and proselytism.

is brought into contact with the untutored savage, who has to learn the rudiments of morality with those of the Christian religion. But they are of no use in dealing with Hindoo or Japanese civilisation.

These characteristics of the Church were moreover peculiarly useful in the Spanish colonies, which were founded in countries where Europeans could not work, where the natives were not industrious, and where the absence of flocks and herds made life dependent on the tillage of the soil, and therefore on the abundant supply of human labour. Here, consequently, the natives became instantly subject to the invader, and were compelled to work on his account. Though they obtained some relief through the importation of Africans, which was due to the humanity of Las Casas, they were generally reduced to the condition of labourers for the profit of the Spaniards. Fixed relations grew up between the races, which required to be regulated by the Church, in harmony with the interests of the weak. The Spaniards were cruel and ruthless task-masters; their pride of race, and their contempt for the foreigner and the heathen, as fierce as that of Jew for Gentile, and as complacent as that of Greek for barbarian, and their natural indolence,—all contributed to make them far more intolerable and more exacting than any other European colonists. The horrors perpetrated by the conquistadores are only equalled by the marvels which were achieved by the Church and the Spanish crown in introducing order and happiness among the settlers and the natives.

The history of the English on the American continent was different. The natives whom they encountered lived mostly by the chase (for North as well as South America were totally destitute of pastoral life). Hence they could not be made to work mines, or to till the soil. The object of the English, therefore, was to get rid of them; and though this was accomplished in general without cruelty or injustice, yet the claim of the Red-skins to the higher civilisation of Christianity was overlooked. In the colonies they could not be turned to account even as Christians; outside the colonies they could not be Christians without discontinuing their wandering life, and even so there would have been no place for them in the English settlements. The colonists were free; at least they enjoyed more liberty than the people at home. They governed themselves. An inferior race could not have existed among them on terms of equality. Such a race would have been quickly reduced to pauperism, and would have fallen into bondage, and have been exposed to unmitigated cruelty. For the English colonies had not, like those of Spain, the protection of a supreme controlling power in the sovereign at home.

Where a society consists of several races, the sovereign power cannot, without certainty of tyranny, be placed in the hands of one part of the society. The supreme political power ought not to be exposed to social interests and influences. It should be identified with the State alone, and should control the forces which move society, and the motives which direct these forces. For society is

an institution for realising private ends, and the greatest happiness of the greatest number; the State for the accomplishment of public ends, altogether distinct from, and comparatively indifferent to, the special interests of any individual, or class, or element, such as religion, or capital. When self-government has currency, and there is no supreme power to keep repulsive forces in combination, there can only be equality among equals. Hence, where there are several unequal races in a republic, the political domination of race over race is sure to arise. In itself this is an evil and a political enormity. Hence the races require a supreme power to secure their several rights. Without this supreme control, self-government slides into the independence of the several races, and this into anarchy. In South America, government never succeeded without the strong control of a supreme though distant power. Where that power was wanting, there have been wars of blood, of colour, and of race. The good governments have been those where despotism has been perfect, that is, where the problem of government has been given up. Where it has been tried, it has failed; whereas in the English colonies it has signally succeeded.

The exclusion of the Red-skins has been the safety of North America, and the introduction of the Blacks only fails to be a fatal evil because they are slaves. If they were free, there would be an end of freedom, both for them and for the whites. But this exclusion was possible only with Protestants. The Church must have resisted such a policy, and then the colonies would probably have assumed a totally different shape.

In comparing our American colonies with those of Spain, the advantages which the northern climate conferred on us must not be overlooked; the moderate supply of the products of nature was a great benefit, for such products as are used without the preparation of art become injurious by too great abundance. Those are the really beneficial products which encourage and facilitate labour, but which also require the application of art and skill before they can be turned to account.

Whether we look at our colonial system from a religious or from a political point of view, the chief distinction we should make lies, as it seems to me, between real colonies where our own emigrants form the nation, and our Asiatic possessions, where we govern a foreign race. The benefit of our system, in those cases where a subject population is governed by a conquering race, depends on its continuance. Hence this benefit has not yet been manifested. For the rise of the new society in Asia has not yet been provided for by the destruction of the old. This is a process which we are only beginning. In time these possessions will exercise the same powerful reaction on the mother country which the others have already exerted.

But at present it would be difficult to find any effects that our possession of India has had upon us. Our method of home-government has not been affected by that of the East-India Company,

and the classes which the Company enriched, the highest middle class and the gentry, were on the whole conservative. Their increased strength was not an element of change in English society or policy. Thus has nature provided for the possibility of that permanence of our government of India, without which it would be of no profit or benefit to the Indian races.

But the centralisation of the Indian government consequent upon the abolition of the Company must produce new phenomena. The first of these will be an enormous strengthening of the power of the State; the second, an aggravation of parliamentary omnipotence. But this, probably, will cure itself. The anomaly of the same assembly governing absolutely in one place and constitutionally in another cannot last. Its lawful, constitutional character would be tainted by arbitrary power. A sovereign can combine the two because he can commit the several governments to distinct bodies—one responsible to him alone, like the Council of the Indies at Seville, the other responsible to the nation as well, like our Parliament. There was this distinction in France between the *parlements* and the *états provinciaux*. But a legislative body cannot so divide its power. The absurdity of the thing gives the first promise of cure, and the symptoms are already favourable; the House of Commons does not listen to Indian debates, and is always empty when they come on. Perhaps in time some scheme will be devised for the independent self-government of our Indian Presidencies, which will deprive our Parliament of its initiative power, and will leave it a *deus ex machina*, not intervening except when a *dignus vindice nodus* claims its interference.

Whatever happens, and however this most difficult problem of reconciling liberty with the government of a dependency peopled by a variety of distinct and inferior races may be solved, what we must desire, for the sake of religion, is that the oriental career of our country should extend beyond the destruction of Eastern politics, even to the demolition of Eastern society.

With our real colonies, which are inhabited chiefly by our own people, the case is exactly the reverse. Their freedom has prevented their doing much for the conversion of the heathen or refinement of savage life. For liberty is the term and aim of all government, not its principle and foundation. It should be present in germ at the foundation of the state, and should grow with its growth. The test of good government is the healthy development of liberty, not its present attainment. It must grow up harmoniously with the state of society, with the relations of classes to each other, and with the manners, customs, and legislation of the community.

In our relations with other races we must accommodate ourselves to a different society. We must strike a balance between our maturity and their minority; we cannot be so free from State control in our intercourse with them as in our intercourse with men of our own country. The State ought to step in for their protection with regulations which we would not tolerate at home. The motto

of the old colony of Massachusetts, "Come over and help us," ought to have been that of our colonial empire.

It is very difficult to determine how to deal with savage natives. If they remain hunters and fishers, they perish as our civilisation pushes forward; for as the new settlements dislodge them from their own grounds, they occupy those of other tribes, and internecine war is the result. If they settle down beside us to cultivate the land, our superiority sinks them to paupers. They can only be saved by a system like that of the Spaniards, which strictly determined their rights, and prevented their being made simply beasts of burden. The Spanish government of the Indies was for the good of the State. The English for that of the settlers; the former for fiscal purposes, the latter for commercial purposes. The crown can make its own laws, but trade will not submit to dictation. No protection, therefore, is possible, and no good is likely to arise for the poor natives from our colonies in savage countries. Besides, the Spanish practice of converting the natives and using their labour was so thoroughly contrary to English ideas, that Bacon knew of no alternative but either expelling the natives, or settling on uninhabited land.

By themselves the laws of trade and economy must ruin the natives, as soon as they came in contact with us, and establish an exchange between us. The promotion of our trade requires us to awaken new desires in them; indeed, these new desires are the inevitable consequences of new knowledge and new ideas. Their old manner of life does not suffice to satisfy these new ideas,—to purchase spirits, weapons, gunpowder, domestic animals, and medicine. As hunters they are destitute of stored wealth. The craving for the new commodities, irrespective of their immoral or dangerous character, must gradually exhaust their means. So the missionaries justly dread the contact. But they cannot prevent it without the closest alliance with and support of the civil power. But how can commerce tolerate such restrictions, or the missionary hold his own against the trader? "The first sight of the horse and his rider," says the Governor of Queensland, Sir George Bowen, "appears to strike a tribe of blacks, as yet ignorant of the white man's existence, with supernatural terror. . . . But superstitious fear is soon succeeded by bitter hostility. Mutual provocations between the races lead to mutual reprisals. The fiercer spirits among the native warriors fall before the superior arms and skill of the European, or are driven still further backwards into the unexplored wilderness. The milder natures sink ere long into the well-fed dependents of the colonists" (*Papers relative to the Affairs of Queensland*, p. 28).

But these colonies, however injurious to the natives, have been most advantageous in their reaction on the parent state. All colonies strengthen the element from which they originate in the home country: in Spain, the crown; in England, the middle class. In the former case, therefore, the influence was monarchical; in the latter, liberal. This is the natural character of colonial life. For in a colony the individual must rely more on himself, as the social power

is less organised, and there is less division of labour ; consequently the individual is a greater unit, and a weightier element of the mass, than in the mother country. This is why colonisation requires the habit of local independence, self-reliance, and self-government ; and why the contrary habit of expecting all things from the government, and of submitting to be counted only *en masse*, is so fatal to colonists. This is why the English and Germans succeed, and the French fail ; except when, like the Canadians, they flourish under English government. The Frenchman is so little independent, so extremely sociable, that he sinks to the level of the society about him when he lives in a savage country. So French colonists never settle but in towns.

Again : the force of old associations and traditions is lost in a colony ; and the national character is modified by the new circumstances, so different from those which helped to mould it at home, and especially by the mixture of races. Thus the conservative, poetical, reverential elements of home society are lost. In old countries there exist habits, customs, laws, even institutions and political forms, the origin of which were clear when they came into being, but are now forgotten. Such customs, therefore, look like anomalies, and have no reason to show for themselves, but are only continued through habit. In colonies there is nothing of the kind. No awe surrounds institutions of which all the colonists have seen the beginning, and which many helped to make. There is no obscurity in external law, nothing unconscious in internal habit. All things have a distinct intelligible purpose and reason. Hence arises a uniformity of law, and a certain rationalism, as the spiritual roots of law must be abandoned in the absence of a common national instinct, of primitive habits, prejudices, superstitions, and faith.

Hence colonies are naturally liberal. If they begin otherwise, they are soon drawn into this tendency by the mixture of races. The offspring of such mixture is always a dissolving and disturbing element in colonial society. The revolution, which afterwards extended to Spain, began in Spanish America. It broke out at the Isla de Loon (Cadiz), in the army which was ready to be shipped off for the reduction of the colonies, and thence it extended over Spain. In Spanish America, especially in Mexico, the half-bloods were often leaders against the pure Spaniards.

A colony goes through the same politico-physiological process as the mother country, only much more rapidly and much more thoroughly ; for the extreme forms of tyranny and democracy are more distinctly and absolutely developed where there is no long customary tradition, no class privileges, no social influence, no remains of the past, to counteract and modify them. Hence also aristocracy is contrary to the nature of colonial life. It is essentially opposed to absolutism, to equality, to levelling, and in most cases to enterprise, because it tries to exempt property from the developing, but possibly dissolving, effect of speculation and exchange. So England has never succeeded in creating a colonial

aristocracy. Yet Burke represented such an aristocracy to be of the utmost importance to Canada. It knits society together, it is equivalent to organisation, it is a strong conservative power,—the nurse of reverence, of respect, of the pride of submission, and of the dignity of obedience ; it is a reminder of all the moral lessons which political society teaches, a preacher of love for home, a bond of the influence of the family over its members, and of respect for ancestral reputation ; it is a storehouse of the invisible forces of society ; and thus it exactly supplies that in which colonies are defective,—it exalts their character and prolongs their existence.

Yet from the absence of aristocracy in the colonies we have derived great benefit. They have influenced us by going a-head so fast, by outstripping the old country, by developing principles which with us are trammelled with natural impediments, by holding out before our eyes a picture of that towards which we are going, and by realising tendencies which cannot be realised here. There has been a very close, though external, connexion between our intercourse with North America and the development of our industry. North America has consequently influenced the progress of our democracy, at least of our free trade. There is the same connexion between the American war and Irish emancipation, as the volunteers, by whose means the old tyranny was for the first time shaken, arose from that war. But there is a much more important connexion in another way.

In our colonies we first learnt to tolerate the Catholic Church. The conquest of Canada first knocked a hole in the system of the penal laws. There was a large French population, just conquered, of doubtful fidelity, whom it would have been madness to oppress in matters of religion. So religious liberty was given to the Canadians ; and while all the American colonies revolted two years after, the conquest we had secured by toleration remained faithful. The first relaxations in Ireland and in England immediately followed. It is beyond question that the natural influence of colonial life on religious liberty was of the highest consequence. This influence is still felt, but has nearly exhausted itself. As far as their action on the Imperial Government is concerned, the colonies have done all that they can do for our benefit.

We have not, therefore, much reason to lament the existence of two laws which the history of colonies seems to reveal—gradual emancipation and premature decline. Our colonies began under James I., when our power was least, when our country was most over-populated through the prevalence of grazing in lieu of tillage, when wages were lowest through the cheapening of the precious metals, and when civil and religious oppression was at its height. They have grown with the growth of the mother country, and have greatly contributed to her increase. From the days of Raleigh and Bacon they had a commercial character ; they were not founded, like the Spanish colonies, simply for gold ; they were fed, peopled, and developed in obedience to the pressure of economical considera-

tions—to get new and fertile lands, new objects of exchange, new markets, increase of shipping and trade, and a refuge for excess of population. The laws of political economy predominate over their whole fate, and are the first element to be studied in drawing their horoscope. The original Navigation Act was passed by the Long Parliament for the purpose of protecting and encouraging British and colonial shipping, in opposition to the Dutch. It was a tax levied by the nation on itself, to be repaid with interest in after times. Such protection may be desirable for the education and nursing of trade. It is a present loss, but it may easily be a future gain. It is seed sown in hope of a harvest. John de Witt foresaw that it would carry much of the trade of the Dutch into English hands.* Child calls the Navigation Act the Magna Charta, Anderson, the Palladium, of our English naval power. New regulations were made for the benefit of England at the expense of the colonies, but this was chiefly after 1688; and it was natural, for a policy of interests is carried out much more ruthlessly by a parliament than by a monarchical government, as it secures the selfish support of interested classes. Generally dependencies are more happy under absolute monarchy than the home country, because authority is necessarily divided and intercepted on its passage to them. This was the case with the provinces of the Roman Empire, and with the Spanish Indies. No wonder, therefore, that the American colonies, flourishing and loyal under the Stuarts, who founded them in consequence of distress and oppression at home, were less happy under the Georges, when we had secured good government at home. When the two evils were combined, when constitutional monarchy was enabled to be arbitrary, by means of the corruption through which George III. and Lord North held in obedience a subservient but omnipotent Parliament, the rebellion of the colonists was natural.

The economical benefit of colonies lasts only as long as the exceptional state of protection can be profitably maintained. The Navigation Act developed our trade at one time, but checked it at another, by diverting our traders from other branches of commerce with foreign countries. It was just at the time when America found that it was no longer her interest to remain dependent, and threw off her allegiance, that Adam Smith laid down the doctrine of free trade, and recommended the emancipation of the colonies, and that Tucker, who condemned the claims of the Americans, advised their emancipation for the sake of England. Townsend, the traveller, about the same time, gave the same advice to Spain, and Arthur

* "Permit me to lead your attention very far back—back to the Act of Navigation; the corner-stone of the policy of this country with regard to its colonies. Sir, that policy was from the beginning purely commercial; and the commercial system was wholly restrictive. It was the system of a monopoly. . . . The Act of Navigation attended the colonies from their infancy, grew with their youth, and strengthened with their strength. . . . Nothing in the history of mankind is like their progress" (Burke's Speech on American Taxation, *Works*, iii. 193-4).

Young to France. The money spent on her colonies, he said, if devoted to the cultivation of her own territory, would produce ten times as much.

We owe to our colonies (1) the development of our trade ; (2) the creation of our naval supremacy ; (3) the rise of true notions of political economy ; (4) the establishment of freedom of conscience. But what they have been powerful to effect they are not necessary to preserve. None of these things would suffer from their loss, though none would have existed had it not been for them. Our encouragement of the emancipation of the Spanish colonies, the abolition of slavery (for some of them), and the removal of the protective system, must lead to the gradual separation of the colonies. In our present course, we cannot long continue to give any commercial privileges to them ; and if we do nothing for them, we cannot go on exacting any thing of them. "Over and above the commerce which she might equally enjoy after separation, England derives little advantage, except in *prestige*, from her dependencies ; and the little she does derive is quite outweighed by the expense they cost her, and the dissemination they necessitate of her naval and military force."*

But it is not in the nature of things that we should emancipate them of our own mere motion. It will probably in all cases be their own act. But emancipated colonies have not a long or very brilliant future before them. They get through their political capital more rapidly than the mother country, for they do not begin at the beginning ; they start from a very advanced period of the nation's life, with a political vitality already considerably expended ; they live, as they thrive, very quickly ; and they have not the retarding, balancing, restraining forces at work in them which prolong the existence of old states. Political and social decline is consequently more rapid with colonies than with parent states, while they retain the colonial character, that is, while they continue a part of the old people.

To begin a new development, with the whole of natural life before them, they must divest themselves of the colonial character, and become, by the mixture of races, a new nationality. Then they can put forth all the natural forms of national and political life, and proceed through the natural phases from childhood to old age. This formation of new nations has only commenced in California and in the eastern states of America. There are few signs of it in our colonies in general, and it has been tried and has failed in the colonies of Spain.

But whatever their future destiny, the European colonies have peopled America and Australia with a Christian population, and have broken down European intolerance. For the future the religious interest is centred chiefly in our Asiatic empire.

C. C.

* J. S. Mill on Representative Government, p. 325.

DELATION.

SIR,—Mr. Tricoupi, the historian of the Greek revolution, thinks that the Turkish government of Greece was much to blame for its habit of dispensing with the services of spies. It was for want of these “lights of the State,” he thinks, that it lost Greece. But although the Turkish contempt for espionage arose rather from a sense of duty and of honour than from any calculation, it has been a good stroke of policy, and has done much for the preservation of the Ottoman Empire. The absence of any systematic scheme of espionage made a large party of Greeks think the Sultan’s government preferable to that of Venice or of Austria, or even to that of their friend the Czar. Who shall decide between these spy-hating Greeks and Mr. Tricoupi? Who shall balance the unpopularity against the utility of the system? Unless, indeed, we go to the bottom of the question, and ask whether, on Christian principles, the system is right and allowable, or the reverse?

The severest punishment of spies and *delatores* was enacted by those governments which had most fostered them, and which most depended upon their services. Among the Roman Emperors, Domitian made himself most conspicuous, both for his employment and his punishment of spies. It is perhaps from his own contributions to this title of the civil law that the old canon is drawn.* *Delatori autem lingua capuletur, aut convicto caput amputetur*,—“Let the delator have his tongue pierced; or if convicted [of accusing falsely], let him have his head cut off.” Thus our old nursery rhyme, like others of its class, is not destitute of venerable authority—“Tell-tale-tit, your tongue shall be slit, and all the dogs in the town shall have a little bit.” In process of time the severity of this early law grew distasteful to the canonists, and they softened it by “mystical” interpretations.

Let the *delator*, they said, if a clergyman, have his tongue tied, and be reduced to silence; and let his head, that is his dignity, be taken from him. If he is a layman, let him do penance, by standing in perpetual silence, in some church; and let him lose his rank, or, if he has none, let him be made infamous.

The delation, which the canon law, in accordance with the judgment of all honourable men, thus reckons infamous, is a *private* information. The grievance of it is its secrecy. The delator, says a French definition, is a *secret* accuser, who fears publicity and evidence. And to show how degrading his business was reckoned, the Parisians had a stock-story about a person of this profession marrying a fallen woman, who, after some time, found out how her husband supported himself, and forthwith hanged herself for very shame, that her marriage, which she thought had restored her respectability, had only degraded her below what she was before.

* Cap. Delatori, v. quest. ult.

The secrecy of informations was effectually provided against by Innocent III., who, in his decree *Qualiter, de accusationibus* (Dec. lib. v.), admits only three modes of proceeding for the correction of faults,—accusation, denunciation, and inquisition. “But in all,” he says, “great care must be taken, lest by too great haste we speed ill. As before accusation there must be the inscription prescribed by law, so before denunciation there must be charitable admonition, and before inquisition public rumour.”

The man who took upon himself to be an accuser was obliged by this law to sign his name to a deed, which bound him, if he failed to prove his case, to suffer the same penalty which the man whom he accused would have to suffer if condemned.* This “inscription” was a strong barrier against secrecy. Inquisition, on the other hand, was originally a process by which the truth or falsehood of current reports against persons was investigated. Here there was no particular accuser; common report was the ground of the proceeding, and was the substitute for a definite accusation. The object of the accuser was to procure the exemplary punishment of the guilty; that of the inquisitor was originally simply to find out the truth. And thirdly, the only recognised object of denunciation, the act of the delator, was the amendment of the person denounced. Hence, as Innocent III. ordered, charitable admonition must always precede denunciation. The man who knows of his brother’s secret fault must always try to correct it by private persuasion before he proceeds to denounce him to his superior.

St. Thomas† goes deeply into the reasons why brotherly admonition must always go before denunciation. Sins, he says, are either public or secret. When they are public, we have not only to correct the sinner, but to see that others are not scandalised; such sins, therefore, are to be punished publicly, according to the text, 1 Tim. v. 20. But if the sins are secret, then we must follow our Lord’s directions in Matt. xviii.: “If thy brother sin against thee,” &c. If he offends you publicly, he sins not against you only, but against the others also whom he scandalises. But if his offence is private, it may still be to the damage of others. For there are secret faults which may result in a public calamity; as when a man secretly plots to betray the State, or secretly tries to pervert others to heresy. And since such a man sins not against you only, but against others also, you ought at once to denounce him, so as to prevent the hurt that might ensue, unless you think that you can effectually prevent it by secret admonition.

But there are sins which only hurt the sinner, or the person against whom he sins, whether directly or by his ill example. And then the only object should be to help the erring brother; and, like a surgeon who cures, if he can, without cutting off the limb, or with the smallest amputation consistent with the preservation of life, he who tries to mend his brother ought, if possible, to heal the con-

* See St. Thomas. Sum. 2da 2dæ, q. 68, art. 4.

† Sum. 2da 2dæ, q. 33, art. 7.

science without damaging the reputation. For good report is necessary to a man, not only in the temporal sphere, but in the spiritual sphere also. How many abstain from sin for fear of losing their good fame ! When such persons have once lost their fame, they will give themselves up to sin. Still, as conscience is to be preferred to good report, it is God's will that the conscience should be freed from sin by public denunciation, even with the loss of fame. Hence it is clear that God's law obliges us (*ex necessitate præcepti*) to admonish secretly before we denounce publicly.

Having thus explained the principle, St. Thomas solves the chief arguments brought against it. A text from Genesis xxxvii. is quoted : "Joseph accused his brethren to his father of a vile offence." St. Thomas replies, "We must suppose that Joseph had previously admonished his brothers, or, at any rate, that the crime was publicly known among them." Another argument was, "It does not seem likely that the common custom of convents should be contrary to the law of Christ ; and this common custom is in the chapters to tell each other's faults without any previous private admonition." St. Thomas replies, that "these accusations in chapter are about trifling affairs which do not hurt a man's reputation, and are rather reminders of forgotten defects than denunciations or accusations. But if they were such as to damage reputation, it would be against the law of God thus to denounce 'hem." Another argument is, "Monks are bound to obey their superiors. But superiors sometimes order all the monks, or some one specially, to tell them every thing he knows of, that wants correcting. Therefore it seems they are bound to tell, even without secret admonition." St. Thomas answers, "No superior is to be obeyed in opposition to God's law. 'We ought to obey God rather than men.' Therefore when a superior commands his monks to tell him whatever faults they know of, we must interpret the command in conformity with the duty of brotherly correction, whether the command is given to all or to one in particular. But if the superior gives an express command in contradiction to this law of God, he sins in giving the command ; and the man who obeys him sins also, as acting against the commandment of God. So that he ought not to be obeyed. For the superior is not judge of secret matters, but only God ; and therefore he has no power to make any law about secret matters, till they become notorious, or suspected ; in which case a religious superior can investigate the affair in the same way as a civil judge."

In the first reply to the arguments of the next article,* St. Thomas says, "Some suppose that the following order is to be observed in administering brotherly correction. First, the brother is to be secretly admonished : if he listens, well ; if not, then, if the sin is altogether secret, nothing more is to be done ; but if it is beginning to ooze out, we must go on to do what our Lord prescribes" (*i. e.* take one or two witnesses, and tell it to the Church). "But this is contrary to what Augustine says in his rule—'a brother's sin

* 2da 2dæ, q. 33, art. 8, ad 1.

should not be concealed, lest it corrupt in the heart.' Therefore we must say that after secret admonition, given one or more times, we must still proceed in the same course while we have any probable hope of amendment; but as soon as we have probable reason to think that secret admonition will be of no avail, we must go on to produce our witnesses, even though the sin should be hidden. Unless we think that this course will not avail to correct our brother, but will only make him worse, in which case we must give up the business altogether."

The authorities I have quoted condemn all private delation, and only allow public denunciation of a private fault when the guilty person has proved incorrigible by private persuasion. There are only two exceptions. First, when the private fault threatens to damage the commonwealth or the Church; then denunciation becomes a duty of self-defence, just as homicide might under analogous circumstances; and secondly, when the private fault is so utterly insignificant that the reputation and the respect in which a man is held lose nothing by its publication. Hence it must follow that denunciation without the previous admonition, or delation, is oftener a sin than a permissible act. But as the habit of tale-bearing must be more apt to run into indiscriminate delation, than carefully to weigh what may be told, and what ought to be concealed, such a habit will probably result in acts which in nine cases out of ten are sinful. Hence I should think that it would be much better to introduce a system where this habit should find no place, than to patronise the habit because it happens to be necessary for a system which happens to exist. The spy system is capable of defence, as being necessary for the preservation of despotic governments; but it is much better logic to condemn despotisms for making spies necessary. If secret delation is sometimes morally indifferent, it is much oftener morally sinful. And the habit that each act of the kind tends to produce and to strengthen is always a temptation and an occasion of sin, and is as infamous and disreputable politically and socially as it is morally degrading.

V. P.

Literary Notices.

History of the Greek Revolution. By G. Finlay. 2 vols. (Blackwood, 1861.) These volumes conclude the series of valuable works in which Mr. Finlay traces the fortunes of the Greeks from the Roman conquest to the establishment of constitutional independence. Almost simultaneously with them there has been published the first part of a *History of the Greek Revolution*, in the fifth volume of the *History of the Nineteenth Century*, by Gervinus. The two works usefully complete each other, inasmuch as our countryman possesses an unrivalled knowledge of the scenes and of the events he describes,

and of the modern Hellenic literature ; whilst the German writes from a higher and remoter point of view, thinks less of Greece and more of Europe in general, and brings to light much new information respecting the negotiations of the great powers. In the mind of Mr. Finlay, familiarity with the people of Greece has bred an unbounded contempt. He neglects no opportunity of confirming from his own observation the disparaging estimate of the Greek character, which he has adopted from Polybius, at the opening of his second volume. "Not to mention other defects, no Greek who is intrusted with public money can refrain from peculation, even if ten commissioners be appointed to watch over the expenditure, and though ten bonds be signed, with twice as many witnesses, as a security for his honesty." Baseness, avarice, treachery, disfigure almost every scene in the war of deliverance. It is strange that a people so sordid should have accomplished an insurrection so ideal in its motives and its aims. The most powerful incentives to armed resistance—the oppression of one race by another, and of one religion by another—were less active in Greece than in many European states. The despotism of the pashas was for many reasons less heavy on the Greeks than on the Turks. The country peasantry were raised by the Turkish conquest to a position which was one of freedom and independence, in comparison with that which they had under the Byzantine emperors and the Franks. The vices of the Greeks singularly adapted them for service under the Ottoman rule, and by becoming its instruments they found compensation for its oppression in sharing the power and the profits of the oppressors. "A wicked government," says Mr. Finlay (i. 128), "requires unprincipled agents; and during the whole of the eighteenth century the Greeks held several important offices in the Sultan's government, because they were without principle." Thousands of wealthy Greeks held aloof from the revolution, and pursued their own interests under Turkish protection.

The result of the conflict was to destroy and depopulate the land, and to introduce for a time an anarchy the most frightful, says Mr. Finlay, that ever desolated a Christian country in modern times. Nor was the intolerance of the Mussulmans more galling than the despotism of the Sultan. Many of the Christian races abandoned the Greeks, and many of the Greeks who dwelt out of their own country were indifferent to the efforts of their countrymen. The hatred of Islam was feeble compared to the hatred of Rome. The Turkish domination, said the patriarch Anthimos, was a salutary safeguard against the Latin heresy. So far was it from being a purely religious war, that in the action at Mesolonghi, in which Botzaris fell, the force of the Greeks was composed of Moslems, and the Turkish army of Catholics. The impulse was partly, indeed, given by the clergy, when the Philike Hetairia gave promise of Russian support; and then their hopes were not of independence, but of a change of masters. This was from no national feeling or hatred of oppression, for the prelates themselves were forced by

simony and the condition of their finances to be among the oppressors of their countrymen. "A bishop," says Mr. Finlay, "could hardly avoid acting like a Turk in office." But though the prospect of becoming subjects of Russia exercised a charm on the Greek priesthood, and although Russia has derived the chief advantage of the Greek revolution, yet it was not a fruit of Russian intrigue. At the time when the outbreak occurred, it was not at all welcome to the Russian government, which was then preponderating in the councils of the Holy Alliance. Although, during the invasion of Russia in 1812, the Emperor Alexander recognised as legitimate the Spanish Cortes and their constitution, yet in 1822, at the height of the reaction, Count Nesselrode denounced it as disastrous and absurd; and the Emperor explained to Chateaubriand that his dynastic interests would be particularly served by a war for the defence of the Greeks, but that he discerned in their rising revolutionary symptoms, and was resolved in consequence to hold back. Even in 1830 Count Nesselrode called it, in private instructions for the Grand Duke Constantine, "the deplorable revolution of 1821."

The Greeks neither deserved their independence nor acquired it themselves. The real significance of the event lies, not in their character or achievements, but in the motives and the consequences of the European intervention. It was the first practical refutation of the legitimist doctrine, the first breach opened in the system of the Holy Alliance. Whilst the Austrians were suppressing the revolution in Italy, and the French in Spain, the cause of the Greeks inspired a sympathy which even Metternich could not withstand; and the principle, that the badness of a government is no reason for upsetting it, had to be abandoned first in the case of the Turks. The precedent was afterwards successfully invoked by the Belgians; and when the Poles appealed to it, they enjoyed the secret but ardent good wishes even of the Austrian statesmen. The conservative principle of the rightfulness of the *status quo*, in its absolute and revolutionary form, in the moment of its triumph at Verona and Cadiz, was destroyed for ever by the Greeks. But it fell, not to make way for a truer notion of right and wrong, but to be supplanted by a new error, which has since proved equally powerful and equally hostile to right and freedom. It was a victory gained not by the right of resistance, or by toleration, or by law against an arbitrary despotism, but by the principle of nationality. Beginning with the rebellion of Ali Pasha in the Adriatic provinces of Turkey, who cared neither for Moslem, Catholic, or Greek, it was carried to its successful end by the western powers, under the belief that the people of Hellas and Morea were the descendants of those to whom European civilisation owes so much. Greece had fallen before the Turks, because the hatred of the Latins was stronger than the love of national independence, and she recovered her freedom when religious differences were hidden in the plea of nationality. Whilst the western powers pursued this chimera, the influence of Russia was founded on the firm basis of dogmatic agreement, and prevailed

in consequence of the reluctance of the other powers, whose classical sympathies were bounded by Thessaly, to give to the new kingdom the means of real independence.

The Philhellenic enthusiasm in Europe, nay, the Hellenic patriotism of the Greeks, was an offshoot of the revival of classical studies at the end of the eighteenth century. Greek students at Jena heard Schiller exalt the glories of their country, and exhort them to deliver it. Coraes, a Greek living among the philologists of Paris, edited the Classics with fervid patriotic prefaces and notes. This antiquarian influence was not without effect; for in Greece, Mr. Finlay tells us (i. 20), a larger proportion could read and write than among any other Christian race in Europe. The Church had kept alive through her service the memory of the ancient language. Corrupted in the pronunciation and in some of the forms, it was less changed than any other European tongue; and the scholarly character of the revolution has had the effect of restoring the purity of the idiom, so that the common people can hardly understand the Greek of the last generation in which the memoirs of Colocotronis are written. On this identity of language, the favourite test of the historians of a former age, the belief in the identity of the modern with the ancient Greeks was founded. To the people themselves, with whom, before the revolution, the ancient Greeks were a mythical race of giants and demigods, the belief in their descent became an axiom, borrowed from the Philhellenes. The first article of the constitution of East Hellas, in 1822, declares that "all the present inhabitants of Greece who believe in Christ are Hellenes." Attentive travellers, like Gell, observed, indeed, a great difference between the races on the mainland and in the islands; but no scientific investigation of the question was made until the sympathies of Europe had been successfully invoked by the Greeks. Then, when the classical enthusiasm had fulfilled its mission, and the imagination of Europe was filled with the verses and the fate of its greatest poet, cold-hearted scholars began to discover and to expose the fallacy on which the Philhellenic ardour was founded. In the instructions given by the Paris librarian Hase to the French expedition to the Morea, after the battle of Navarino, he expressed the opinion that the Hellenic population of the Peloponnesus was expelled by Slavonic immigrants in the eighth century. When Bavaria sent forth a king and an army to take possession of Greece, a Bavarian professor, till then unknown, but famous since as the only historian whom for the union of eloquence, scepticism, learning, and malignity his countrymen can compare to Gibbon, proclaimed and established in a series of brilliant works that the only true descendants of the Greeks survive in the Ionian Islands, on the coast of Anatolia, and among the Phanariots at Constantinople; the very people to whom independence has been denied. Fallmerayer's opinion, which was bitterly attacked at the time, and which his character did as much to injure as his ability had done to establish, has prevailed at last. But for the rage for an imaginary nationality, it would have found

less resistance, as the mixture of blood is one of the conditions of the greatness of nations.

Aids to Faith. A series of Theological Essays by several Writers; edited by William Thompson, D.D., Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. (Murray.)—*Replies to Essays and Reviews*; with a Preface by the Lord Bishop of Oxford. (John Henry Parker.)—*Examination of Prevalent Opinions on Inspiration*; with Introduction by the Rev. H. B. Wilson. The question mooted by the "Essayists and Reviewers" takes two forms in minds variously constituted. To the Anglican churchman it is, "To whom is the Bible committed, and who is to interpret it?" To the Protestant who has no church, it is, "What is the true interpretation of the Bible?" At the time of the Reformation, says Mr. Haddan, the writer of the sixth "Reply," the innovators attacked "the Church such as it had grown to be without the Bible;" while the modern innovators attack "the Bible, such as men have made it without the Church." Such apologists, with the Bishop of Oxford, appeal to authority, and invoke the "severe censures" of the Church of England upon the Essayists. But they know that their arguments will not touch those against whom they are invented. "The Churchman's defence," says Mr. Irons, "will not avail the merely literary believer." "Mere denials and protests," says Dr. Goulburn, "will avail little or nothing;" the only way of reclaiming the innovators is by "a candid acknowledgment of those truths after which the Essayists are groping." The other antagonists of the Essayists do not make this appeal to authority, but they have a clearer view of the position into which the Reformation put the Church of England. They see how impossible it is to defend that Church for having transferred the Bible from the hands of the Catholic Church to the private piety of the sectarians, and at the same time to refute the modern innovators, who wish in turn to take it out of the hands of these blind devotees, and to intrust it to the enlightened criticism of sceptical scholars. They therefore accept the controversy as it is proposed to them by the Essayists, and critically examine what is the true interpretation of the Bible.

This discussion has several branches. The idea of inspiration, the human or historical element in Scripture, and the rights of criticism in relation to writings claiming to be inspired; the signs of inspiration, miracles and prophecy; and the doctrines which are revealed in the Scripture: all these are points which the Essayists have attacked, and which have been defended with more or less success by their answerers.

Those of the replies which take the ground of the authority of the Anglican Establishment are singularly wild. Mr. Irons argues with much ability on Catholic principles, and concludes, not with proving that they are the principles of the Establishment, but with demanding that the Establishment should be "adjusted" to them. Mr. Cook, who writes in the *Aids to Faith*, enunciates the curious theory that the Anglican layman is one "whose opinions are in

process of formation," while the clergyman is one whose mind is made up on all essential points : hence one signs the Thirty-nine Articles, the other does not. Dr. Goulburn and Dr. Wordsworth, having no critical faculty of their own, naturally take the side of authority, which they back up with heavy writing. Dr. Wordsworth, indeed, is worse than heavy ; his affected pleasantry and laboured jocularity make him offensive as well as tedious.

Of the Essays on the evidences, that by Mr. Mansel on Miracles, in *Aids to Faith*, is incomparably the best. Dr. M'Caul on Prophecy, and Mr. Rawlinson on the Pentateuch, are learned, but not very logical. After the summary way in which Mr. Rose in one volume, and Dr. M'Caul in another, condemn the German critics because they do not agree together, it is instructive to compare Dr. M'Caul's interpretation of Genesis i. in one volume with Mr. Rorison's in the other. One begins with proving that it is poetry, the other that it is not poetry ; one argues that the first verse describes a distinct event, the other that it is merely a summary of the chapter ; and so on.

Of the Essays on particular doctrines, that by Dr. Thompson on the Sufferings of Christ is excellent. Indeed, this and Mr. Mansel's are the only two of any permanent value. Those on Inspiration in both volumes are painfully deficient ; and this is the most important of the questions raised. As Mr. Wilson puts it in his introduction to the *Examination*, it is "whether in the Scriptures God has revealed Himself mediately or immediately ; by a supernatural process, or through a natural but no less divine order." This is a studiously insufficient way of expressing the doubt, which extends not only to inspiration but to grace. The worst features of Pelagianism are being reproduced by a school which every where explains the supernatural order to be a mere natural development of the natural order, and admits no real distinction between the laws of nature and the laws of God's supernatural dealings with men. Mr. Baden Powell was the most offensive writer of this school, because he uttered what he meant without circumlocution. The other Essayists shared his openness of speech. Mr. Maurice, Mr. Goldwin Smith, and hosts of others, belong intellectually to the same school, though they overlay their theory with plentiful expressions of reverence and religiosity, which seem strangely out of place when applied to matters merely human. This part of the controversy is most successfully, though indirectly, dealt with by Mr. Mansel.

Of the two volumes we have noticed, the *Aids to Faith* is far the best. It contrasts both with the *Essays* and with the *Replies* in the manly way in which Dr. Thompson accepts the responsibility of the whole volume, and leaves each contributor to answer only for his own Essay. The Bishop of Oxford, on the contrary, professes not to have read the volume for which he writes the preface, and in consequence, he entirely misrepresents the spirit of the *Replies* which he edits. In one thing both volumes contrast ominously with the *Essays*,—in the absence of any deep and unconscious unity of pur-

pose. The instances where the writers flatly contradict each other are innumerable.

The City of the Saints, and across the Rocky Mountains to California. By Richard F. Burton, author of "A Pilgrimage to El Medinah and Meccah." (London : Longmans.) This remarkable book contains the best account of the religion and the institutions of the Mormons, and of the phenomena of their social life. As an observer, Mr. Burton has the advantage of not being a Christian, or, at least, of very successfully concealing it, if he is one. "All knowledge concerning man," says one of the most eminent of the Catholic medieval philosophers, "consists in two things : in the knowledge of what ought to be, and the knowledge of what is—of duty and of fact. And the knowledge of duty ought to come before the knowledge of fact, because it is only a kind of light to know the fact by ; for we cannot know the fact, whether it is as it ought to be or not, unless we first know the duty. For the duty is the measure, and rule, and law, of the fact. He, therefore, who knows not the duty, knows not the fact." Then the philosopher appeals to experience : "that all our doing, both inside us and outside us, and all our leaning, is quite against duty, or the right and law of nature" (Raymund de Sabunde, *Natural Theology*, part v. tit. ccxxiii. p. 346).

There are two consequences from this doctrine. First, that we must not get our notions of duty from history ; for history only tells us what is, and what is utilitarian, but can never tell us what ought to be. And, secondly, that we must not get our notions of fact from our notions of duty, because, as Raymund says, fact is clean contrary to duty. Now, in the case of a set of men who have swallowed so monstrous a hoax as the Mormon revelation, and who have been such traitors to the laborious result of European and Christian civilisation as to reëstablish polygamy in more than Asiatic redundancy, the rebellion against duty is so obvious and so horrible, that it is difficult for any decent man who goes to look at them so to master his ideas of right as not to let them modify, in many respects, his view of the fact. Accordingly, the "Gentile" writers, who have up to this time been our authorities for the internal economy of Mormon life, are accused by Mr. Burton, and with apparent reason, of monstrous partiality, and of a greedy and uncritical acceptance of all current scandals. Mr. Burton not having, or at least not showing, any undue bias either way, is able to weigh, in equal scales, the competitive claims of monogamy, polygamy, and polyandry, to the favour of the human race, in a way that, while it has its attractions to the physical inquirer or the historian, must banish his book, in spite of the lightness of its general contents, from well-conditioned drawing-rooms.

Not that Mr. Burton is a historian any more than Mr. Buckle, whom he admires so greatly. He is an excellent traveller, whose observing powers are first-rate, but whose reasoning powers are

small. With an abundance of energy, and a determination to make any condition of life that is tolerable permanently to any class of human beings tolerable to him for a time, while he makes the experiment of it, Mr. Burton has been able to assume characters that other travellers shrink from assuming, and to visit and live among people that other travellers would either not be permitted, or would not be able to prevail upon themselves, to live amongst. And while dwelling among these various specimens of human nature, if he has not lived their life, he has at least always made himself an advocate of their mode of living, partly by showing how the evil consequences of their systems are counteracted in practice, but chiefly by retorts and *tu quoque* arguments addressed to his readers. Thus he rebukes Christians who are shocked at the Mormon "plurality," by reproaching them with the great social evil of most Christian cities, from which he says Utah is entirely free. Thus also politicians, who detest the prying of the prophet into all the private concerns of the sojourners in the City of the Saints, have to digest the retort that they had better look at home, to the Post-office of Paris, and even of London, when there are rumours of treason afloat. Not an abuse of Mormonism can be cited for which he has not one of these isolated and unconnected authorities in some degenerate Christian practice.

After clearing away all these flippant pleas, which will convince nobody, there remain two points on which Mr. Burton's evidence is of great value. First and chiefly, the state of Mormon society and opinion, the morals, manners, and customs of the followers of Brigham Young. Mr. Burton seems to have been allowed more unrestrained intercourse with them than other Gentiles, probably because a reputed Turk would be less suspected of abominating their peculiar institutions than a Christian. Thus he saw more; and, as he saw all with unruffled equanimity, he describes it more fairly. The second point on which his evidence is valuable, though to a less degree, is the Mormon belief. The documents of the sect are open to any one who chooses to spend a few shillings in buying them; but Mr. Burton's study of them was helped by intercourse with Mormon doctors, by a knowledge of the history of their development, by the general atmosphere of opinion in the "City of the Saints," and by a habit of throwing his mind into strange forms of religious belief. He has a practical acquaintance with Brahminism, perhaps with Buddhism, and an intimate knowledge of Mahometanism; and to all these systems he finds points of resemblance in Mormonism. If he had a better historical knowledge of the dead religions of Persia and Egypt, and of those of the Gnostic sects, he would have been able to draw out his proof of the recurring character of forms of belief much more fully. The Mormon faith deserves investigation, not only because it has revived among an illiterate mob the cloudy dreams of old Oriental mysticism, in combination with the hardest materialism of modern positive schools; but also because it has given rise to a kind of pagan sect, in legitimate descent from Pro-

testant and Methodist fanaticism, and has spontaneously reproduced among Anglo-Saxons, generally so averse from hierarchical institutions, a community in which a Popedom, an Apostolic succession, a system of surveillance ten times more rigid than any that was ever plausibly attributed to the confessional, and the temporal sovereignty of an autocratic and theocratic pontiff, are necessary elements of the common creed, and articles of a standing or falling church.

The Early Italian Poets, from Ciullo d'Alcamo to Dante (1100 to 1300); together with Dante's Vita Nuova. Translated by D. G. Rossetti.—*The Vita Nuova of Dante*, with Introduction and Notes. By Theodore Martin.—*Romantic Episodes.* Translated by Alexander Vance.—*Story of King Arthur and his Knights of the Round Table.* (Griffith and Farran). We put these four books together because they are all connected with a revived interest in, or curiosity about, the ages of chivalry. The last volume is a kind of drawing-room or school-room edition of a round of romances, which are worth more when transfigured by Tennyson into Idylls than in their raw state. The third consists of a series of short tales, histories, and moral extracts, from writers of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, many of them outside the chivalrous age. The two first volumes carry us into the very heart of chivalry, which they exhibit in its most interesting phase—in its philosophy of love. Mr. Theodore Martin, however successfully he may have rendered the abandonment and the passion of Catullus, has failed in translating the mystical and measured love of Dante. Catullus speaks in the tones of nature; Dante forces nature into the mould of a philosophy, which Mr. Martin has not given himself the trouble to understand. A person who can translate the words "*in potenzia ed in atto*" by "in its powers and in its actions," is clearly unfit to interpret the philosophic poet of Italy; and he is so conscious of this, that in his introductory essay he strives to prove that the *Vita Nuova* is no recondite essay on mystical science, but a plain narrative of an ordinary courtship. Mr. Rossetti is the son of the celebrated Professor Rossetti, whose ingenious attempts to give a political meaning to all Dante's allegories were so fiercely assailed some thirty-five years ago: he has therefore a sort of traditional knowledge of the poet. He has kept his translation by him for years, gradually improving and perfecting it, and has at last given us a volume which is exceedingly interesting both historically and poetically.

The circle of Italian poets of whom Mr. Rossetti gives us specimens forms, perhaps, the only European lay literature of its epoch (1100 to 1300). The subject on which they usually write is love; but in their hands love was so universal a philosophy that it came to mean any thing in the whole range of science and politics. But many of the poems have a direct political bearing; some are directed against the rage for voluntary poverty that distinguished the era of St. Francis. Others are simply expressions of joviality or of cynicism. Guido Guinicelli, the greatest of the precursors of

Dante, writes about "moderation and tolerance" as a modern would. The volume gives great insight into medieval life in Italy.

Lives of the Engineers. By Samuel Smiles. (London : Murray.) The object of Mr. Smiles, who is already known to the public by his *Life of George Stephenson* and his very successful work *Self-Help*, in these two handsome volumes, is to give "an account of some of the principal men by whom the material development of England has been promoted," by reclaiming land for cultivation, forming the internal communications of the country, and lighting up its coasts.

It comes out in the course of the volumes, especially in the chapter on "Early Roads and Modes of Travelling," vol. i., and in the first chapter of the life of Rennie, in vol. ii., that there have been two periods of a great material civilisation in England and Scotland, separated by a period of barbarism, which began with the change of religion in the sixteenth century. In the latter chapter especially Mr. Smiles contrasts what Dr. Johnson somewhere calls "the sleepy laziness of the men that erected churches," bridges, roads, and all that was required for active national life, "with the fervid activity of those who suffered them to fall," in a way that is quite as striking as Mr. Buckle's indictment against the all-destroying fanaticism of the Scotch Presbyterians in the second volume of his *Civilisation*, and which is, at the same time, much more valuable, because it is written without prejudice or predetermined purpose. The monks, in the former period of national wealth, were the great workmen, and the reconcilers of industry with religious occupation. After them came a period of misery and degradation, under the ignoble rule of the low-born and low-bred teachers of Protestantism. And this period was succeeded by one in which, through such men as Mr. Smiles describes in these volumes, industry was restored, not now as a religious occupation, but as in itself the highest aim of the human intellect and soul. Not that Mr. Smiles would avowedly divorce it from religion ; but he seems to contemplate engineering success in its results, and to make it the highest manifestation of love for man, and therefore of love for God, because it is productive of the greatest convenience and benefit to society in general ; because it saves life, mitigates want, economises labour, and provides leisure for self-improvement.

Words can hardly be too enthusiastic in praise of the social and economical merits of the men who have given us these splendid results, in giving us the power of gaining them. The only thing we counsel their admirers to avoid is, the assumption that these works necessarily imply the moral and spiritual eminence of the soul whose intellect plans them, or that it is impossible to be at once a benefactor to the whole world in public, and a godless sensualist in private.

Current Events.

HOME AFFAIRS.

THE shadow of our great national bereavement still hangs over the land, but the twofold gloom under which the year opened was in part dispelled, on the 9th of January, by the arrival of intelligence that the Government of the United States had disavowed the act of Captain Wilkes, the commander of the *San Jacinto*, and had consented to surrender Messrs. Mason and Slidell. As this surrender was the only essential portion of our own demand, the war which had seemed imminent was at once put out of the question, and renewed confidence succeeded to that vague sense of approaching calamity which for some weeks had pervaded the public mind.

No disparagement to Lord Russell's diplomacy is involved in the admission that its fortunate issue was hardly less due to the warlike preparations by which it was supported than to its own courtesy and firmness. The capture of the Southern envoys had only become known in England on the 27th of November; the demand for reparation was despatched on the 30th; and it was instantly determined to double the strength of our squadron on the coast of North America, and to send out a force of 12,000 men for the defence of the Canadian provinces. Within ten days after the Government had come to this decision, the first troops had embarked; at the end of three more weeks, the whole force had left our shores, provided with all the appliances of war, down to the minutest working detail. The responsibility of carrying out these measures devolved on Lord de Grey, and the country will not fail to appreciate the remarkable difficulty of the task, or the perfect success with which it was accomplished. The troops carried with them 66,000 rifles, 10,000 muskets, 71,000 sets of accoutrements, 15 million rounds of ammunition, 40,000 great-coats, 36,000 blankets, 15,000 suits of warm clothing, two complete 12-pounder batteries, 1 9-pounder battery, 30 sledges, with harness com-

plete, forge and hand carts, spare tumbrils and ambulance wagons, scaling ladders, entrenching tools, tools for sappers, hospital stores and bedding for purveyors, 400 cases of medical comforts, hospital clothing, 25 pairs of litters, 150 pack-saddles, 6 hospital wagons, an electric telegraph with wires, batteries, and instruments, and a large number of 100-pounder Armstrong guns, with carriages and platforms complete, upwards of 1000 tons of gunpowder, 1000 solid shot for the North American squadron, 5000 32-pounder naval shells, and 5000 10-inch naval shells. Besides this, every battalion took 1 marquee, 2 hospital tents, 130 circular tents, 1800 blankets, 900 canteens, 180 camp-kettles, 2 medicine chests, 900 surgical bandages, 900 cholera-belts, 70 hatchets, 2 pack-saddles, 10 spades, 10 shovels, 16 pick-axes, 20 felling-axes, 6 saws, 6 files, 12 whetstones, 10 hammers, and 20 wedges. The whole of this enormous equipment was completed in thirty days; and within a nearly identical period the fleet under Admiral Milne, consisting of 5 line-of-battle ships, 10 frigates, and 17 corvettes and sloops, mounting in all 850 guns, received an addition of 2 line-of-battle ships, 23 frigates, and 8 corvettes, mounting in all 1000 guns.

The chord thus struck by the energy of ministers vibrated through the country. The naval reserve, which has risen to 9000 men, since the absurd and worse than ineffectual bounty was superseded by adequate pay, volunteered with alacrity at all the chief stations. The great shipping and railway companies placed their means of transport at the disposal of the public departments, without any stipulation as to price. The local authorities at the ports of embarkation vied with the Government officials in eager anxiety for the success of the expedition. And throughout the Volunteer force, which, in its different arms — Rifle, Artillery, Engineers,

and Light-Horse—now numbers upwards of 150,000 men, the prospect of actual service in defence of our own shores was welcomed with enthusiasm; while some of its members even, overlooking in their exuberant patriotism the object and conditions of their service, offered to take part with the regular troops in the hardships and dangers of an American campaign.

Meanwhile the Canadians were not less active in their own defence, or less hearty in the expression of their loyalty to the crown, while they differed from their fellow-subjects here in manifesting an actual desire for war with the United States, even though their own country was to be the field of battle. In addition to 7,500 of the active militia, about 35,000 of the sedentary militia were called out; and the volunteer corps mustered a force of 20,000 men. As soon as the news of Captain Wilkes's exploit arrived, Sir Fenwick Williams, who commanded the troops in the colony, paid a visit of inspection to all the important stations along the exposed frontier, and every possible preparation was made to defend them against a sudden attack. New batteries were hastily constructed at Toronto. Guns, arms, and stores were sent from Quebec to the magazines in the interior. At Montreal, when the telegraphic message announcing the rupture was read aloud at the Exchange, "cheer after cheer rang out to welcome it;" and in a week the volunteer force was doubled. The Catholic Bishop offered his palace for use as a barrack; and throughout the colony the Catholic clergy appear to have distinguished themselves by their zealous and effectual exhortations to their parishioners to volunteer for the common defence.

The attitude thus assumed by Canada is striking as an evidence of her own vigour, and her attachment to the mother country; and it acquires a special interest from the variety of the races which compose the Canadian population, and the peculiarities of their religious distribution. The census of the current year, which shows an increase of 36 per cent on that of 1852, estimates the entire population at 2,506,755. Of this number 1,917,777 are native Canadians;

1,037,170 of British, and 880,607 of French origin. In 1852, this native population was 73 per cent of the whole; it is now 76; and it is remarkable that the increase is confined to the French Canadian branch, which then numbered 35 per cent, and now numbers 38; while the British Canadians have remained at the proportion of 28 per cent. Besides the native population, the colony contains 241,423 Irishmen, 127,429 Englishmen and Welshmen, 111,952 Scotchmen, 64,399 natives of the United States, 23,855 Germans, 12,717 Indians, and 3,061 Frenchmen. The remainder are coloured people, chiefly resident in Upper Canada. The religious distribution of the community is as follows: Catholics, 1,200,870; members of the Church of England, 374,887; Methodists, 372,462; Presbyterians, the larger half of whom belong to the Free Church of Scotland, 346,991; Baptists, 69,310. The rest are of no particular religion. From these figures it appears, that of the members of the four Protestant denominations, the Church of England does not contain a third, while the Catholics, who in 1852 numbered 47 per cent only, now number upwards of 50 per cent on the whole religious census.

The satisfaction inspired by the progress of events in relation to Canada has been qualified by the existence of serious distress nearer home. In Ireland the failure of the last year's crops, following on the worse than doubtful harvest of 1860, has been felt severely by the small farmers and tradesmen, especially in the south and west; and though the cry of complaint may have been pitched in a higher key than the facts would altogether justify, it certainly approaches far nearer to the truth than the complacent optimism by which it has been met. The number of work-house inmates is never a fair test of Irish distress; and the institution of relief committees, for the first time since 1847, in districts which of late years have been flourishing and progressive, is a fact which cannot be swept away by the reckless and inaccurate assertions in which Sir Robert Peel is too much accustomed to indulge. There is no foundation for his reiterated statement that the Irish landlords have ignored the distress

which exists around them. Nor is it easy to harmonise his own contemptuous denial of any ground for apprehension with the defence of Government measures, which, however small in their proportions, essentially imply a condition of exceptional need. That their proportions are small is, however, by no means a fault; for the need has not yet risen to that point beyond which local resources would become inadequate to meet it; and until it does so, a grant of imperial money, whether for the purpose of direct relief or for employment in reproductive works, is very strongly to be deprecated. Such a grant, under present circumstances, would be unjust to the Empire at large; and it would create a distinction which Irishmen should be the last to desire between its recipients and the labouring classes in Lancashire and other northern counties of England, where the blockade of the American ports has thrown a very large number of workmen out of employment altogether, and reduced a still larger number to work only half-time.

So heavily, indeed, has this consequence of the blockade pressed on our manufacturing population, that it seemed likely at one time to afford occasion for a party struggle on the meeting of Parliament. The Government had lost several seats during the recess; and the opposition press took advantage of the strong feeling raised by the *Trent* outrage to urge the breaking of the blockade under any circumstances, and even to indicate the policy of a full recognition of the Southern Confederacy. But the new Tory members have, most of them, oddly enough, been returned on a definite pledge to support Lord Palmerston; and they know that it would be useless at present to ask their constituents for the ratification of any vote which would have the effect of driving him from power. The game of the Opposition, therefore, is to wait. Accordingly, when Parliament met, on the 6th of February, their leaders not only showed no desire to engage in a trial of strength, but explicitly adopted the ministerial policy of neutrality in the American Civil War, and endorsed with complete approval the steps

taken by the Government with regard to the affair of the *Trent*. On this latter point the favourable judgment of the House of Commons was afterwards expressed with striking unanimity on the motion for going into Committee of Supply on the 17th of February. The question coming under discussion was the Supplementary Army and Navy Estimates for the expenses of the North American reinforcements; and Mr. Bright took the opportunity of arraigning Ministers for having supported Lord Russell's despatch by preparations, "both as regarded the army and the navy, exactly as if the despatch itself had not been a courteous demand for compliance with a just request, but rather a declaration of war." To take such a course, he maintained, was to raise a needless and mischievous alarm in this country; to place a false issue before the American Government; and to put difficulties in the way of Mr. Lincoln's compliance with a demand which American principles and precedents would otherwise have led him to concede as a matter of course. Lord Palmerston gained an easy triumph in reply by an analysis of some of the familiar facts: showing the support Captain Wilkes had received from the people, the administration, and the legislature of his own country, and arguing that to have left Canada and the British North American Colonies undefended would have been to invite a continuance of that support, and consequently to necessitate a war.

Beyond the Supplementary Estimates, Parliament has not yet passed any thing of importance. On the 13th of February, a statement was made by Lord Granville in the House of Lords, and Mr. Lowe in the House of Commons, on the revised Educational Code, which we have discussed elsewhere; and on the 17th the Lord Chancellor introduced his Bill for simplifying the Transfer of Land, founded on the same principle as that brought in by Sir Hugh Cairns in 1859. Lord Cranworth and Lord Chelmsford have each brought in two Bills on the same subject; and all the five are to be read a second time on the 3d of March.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

France: The Society of St. Vincent of Paul.

France, a country of democracy, and yet without any poor-law, or legal provision against the effects of poverty, has developed, in the Society of St. Vincent of Paul, an institution in wonderful harmony with the laws of political economy. The object of all poor relief should be to cure, not to encourage poverty; and the remedy for poverty, as distinguished from the remedy for the accidental sufferings springing from bad harvests or commercial failures, does not lie in the material resources of the rich, but in the moral resources of the poor. These moral resources are only put to sleep, and at last killed, by gifts of money, which preserve the life of the poor man in his necessity, and therefore must always be an element in a poor-law, but which, by themselves, always tend to give longer life and more strength to pauperism. The strength of pauperism can only be undermined by personal and moral influences, sympathy and charity. The best poor-law organisation is, therefore, one like that of the Society of St. Vincent of Paul; for only such a plan can intercept poverty on its way to pauperism, and can permanently relieve, not only the poor, but the State. Poverty arises from two sources: the fault of the poor man, and external circumstances over which he has little control. It is only the latter kind of poverty that is really relieved by gifts; the former can only be mitigated and prevented by influences which do not belong to the State; and the social action of these influences tends to restrict pauperism to those who are poor by no fault of their own; and only these have a real claim on the State, and a distinct right to be directly supported by the public. Indiscriminate almsgiving is as contrary to the maxim of the Apostle as to political science; and only almsgiving undiscriminated by moral tests is possible in a poor-law which employs no moral influences, but only distributes material resources.

On the other hand, no State can admit an *imperium in imperio*, an independent corporation within the State, which has the same political objects as the State has. Where there is a sharp distinction between political and social objects, this principle produces no inconveniences; but where the State pretends to all the rights of providence over the social, the moral, and the religious well-being of its citizens, the principle amounts to a negation of all corporate rights whatever. Such is the result of the French system of government. A despotic State, founded on a proletariat, is naturally jealous of influences which come between it and the basis of its power; and the doctrine of such States is, that, since the government undertakes to do for the people every thing that subordinate corporations could undertake, such corporations are both superfluous and derogatory to the majesty of the supreme power. Thus, the Convention decreed, August 18, 1793, that "a State absolutely free ought not to suffer any corporation to exist within it, not even such as have, by devotion to public instruction, deserved well of their country." This was only a revival of a principle of Lewis XIV., who, although in his capacity of Providence he thought it his duty sometimes to approve solemnly of acts of charity done by others, and this in a way to adopt them as his own, yet, on other occasions, threatened to punish all acts of private beneficence, on the ground that the King, as the absolute State, and no one else, was the asylum and shelter of the poor in France.

Lewis Napoleon takes the line of Lewis XIV. He only suppresses works of charity when they are not done in his name. This is the meaning of Persigny's circular to the prefects, dated October 16, which points out the "necessity of legalising charitable societies." It is only, he says, the "inconvenience" of their independence, *i. e.* the fundamental contradiction between their independent existence and the claims of the absolute State, of which government has

to complain ; while "they merit all the sympathy of the government for the good works they accomplish in the country." There are many such societies in France. Those of St. Vincent of Paul, St. Francis Regis, and St. Francis de Sales, are religious ; that of the Freemasons secular, but "purely philanthropic." To the "order and spirit" of the Freemasons Persigny has no objection to make, only to its central organisation, and to "a mode of election calculated to promote a rivalry between various lodges," which must be always painful to the heart of a truly paternal government.

The religious associations, "founded to distribute assistance to the indigent, and to lecture and instruct the working classes," zealously pursue their virtuous object, powerfully contribute to the relief and reformation of the poor, and concur in maintaining the sentiment of charity among the rich ; their spirit, too, is completely "disengaged from all political bearings;" nevertheless, this praise only attaches to the local conferences, not to the provincial, still less to the general councils. The provincial committees, under the appearance of encouraging the particular efforts of various conferences, usurp their direction, deprive them of the right of electing their own officers, and thus rule all the societies of a province, so as to make them the instruments of an idea foreign to that of charity. An absolute government cannot tolerate this infraction of personal liberty. The superior council in Paris is a directing committee, not appointed by the local societies, but self-elected ; it arrogates the right of governing them, so as to make of them a kind of secret society, having branches beyond the bounds of France ; and it levies contributions from them, the employment of which is not known. The interests of charity alone do not require this organisation ; men at Lyons or Marseilles must know better than men at Paris the wants of the poor at Marseilles and Lyons "In fine, does Christian charity require for its exercise to be constituted under the form of secret societies?" Therefore Persigny tells the prefects to authorise all local conferences, but to suppress all provincial committees ;

and if the local conferences should afterwards desire to have at Paris, near the seat of government, a central representation, the Emperor will determine on what basis and principles this central council may be organised. Till then the central council is suppressed.

In spite of the protests of all parties in France, this resolution has been carried out ; and the conferences of St. Vincent of Paul can now only exist in as much subjection to the direction of the government as the newspaper press or the Exchange. The greater the folly and wickedness of this step, the more important is it as a *reductio ad absurdum* of the theory of government which finds favour over all Latin Europe.

The Budget.

In spite of the increasing wealth of France, the condition of the money-market had long shown that there was disorder in the finances ; and those who suspected this disorder were confirmed in their suspicions by Persigny's severe treatment of those who wrote on finance in the press. No one was therefore amazed at the deficit announced by M. Fould in his report, dated last September, and published in the *Moniteur* in November last. A deficiency of 40,000,000*l.* on the budget of a single year could only be met by loans, and loans could only be contracted if credit was restored ; and the most likely way of restoring credit was to make confession of the past, and to promise amendment for the future. But a dynasty which "personifies the instincts of national pride [the instinct of war], and of laborious emulation" [that of modified communism], could amend nothing but a few abuses and dilapidations, which make but a small part of the deficit ; it could never really decrease its military expenses, or suddenly cease to provide work for the people, or to cheapen bread for them. The Orleans dynasty had accepted this supposed duty of providing work and food ; but between 1833 and 1857 these extraordinary expenses were only 2142 millions of francs, or about twice as much as the present deficit ; whereas the extraordinary resources—loans for the most part—in the five years

from 1853 to 1857 inclusive were 2167 millions, and in the same period the extraordinary works have cost 421 millions. The works, then, have figured for a small portion only of the grand total of extravagance, which was for the most part incurred in virtue of the Imperial decrees, without the previous concurrence of the Chambers. We see, then, what an enormous irresponsible power the Emperor has hitherto possessed in finance. The question is, does he by the present modifications lose any of this power? M. Troplong's report, read in the Senate Dec. 17, shows that no such loss was ever contemplated.

The present constitution of France M. Troplong describes as being "the alliance of the ideas of liberty of 1789 with the ideas of order of 1852. . . . It did not undertake to restore the liberty, the combination and forms, which were crushed in 1848 by the revolution, and which universal suffrage declared incompatible with the wants of a society guided by democracy, but fearing the abyss into which it might be hurried by the weakness of the pilot, or of the helm. The country under this constitution must obtain all the franchises which it can support without injury to itself; but the government must not lose any of the attributes which constitute its liberty (absolutism), and which necessarily belong to its authority." That is, it must not lose any of its present power in regulating by itself the expenditure of the country.

During the parliamentary government and the Republic, the French budget of expenses for the coming year was voted by chapters; that is, in divisions specifying the particular objects to which the money was to be applied, and the amount to be spent on each. But the constitution of 1852 altered this arrangement, and certain sums were from that time voted to the ministers of the respective departments, to be expended by them at their discretion, on the matters under their control, without any previous specification of the particular objects.

Since 1852 the voting has been, and will continue to be, a mere form; for no deputy can propose any amendment to the budget till the amend-

ment has been adopted by the Committee of the Budget, and by the Council of State.

As the budgets are voted eighteen months before they are spent, it is clear that no ordinary mortal, not even "the man who reads the future," as the Emperor is called by M. Troplong in proposing this present acknowledgment of his shortsightedness, can foresee and provide for all the accidents that may happen. Such accidents can only be met by expedients of the moment: there are two classes into which such expedients naturally fall; either some department of expenditure is starved, and its revenue transferred to that upon which the accident presses, or the ordinary expenditure remains as it was voted, and the pressure is met by additional and extraordinary credits. There is not much difference in principle in these two methods, for the starved department virtually runs into debt, while the extraordinary credit is only the same debt avowedly placed to the account of the department whose necessities really caused it. M. Troplong's report, however, makes great play with the suppression of the extraordinary credits, and the substitution of the system of transfers.

The real reform wanted was the transfer of the power of making these supplementary credits from the hands of the Emperor to those of the representative bodies, or of ministers responsible to them; but this is by no means to happen. It is the Emperor, in his Council of State, who will still regulate all the transfers.

Thus, as M. Troplong says, politically "the measure is only a change in the form of proceeding;" there is no substantial alteration—"it is not the disavowal of a glorious past," nor is it "a consequence of accumulated embarrassments," but a free act of a government that is master of the situation. The Emperor does not repent of the expenses he has forced on France, for "France is a democracy. . . . But democracy does not become softened and disciplined under the hand of the government which it accepts, unless that government embraces in a vast view its numerous, varied, and active interests. Hence come the vast enterprises, great works, economic reforms, military glory, ge-

neral activity, and progressive welfare," on which the imperial government has spent so many millions during the last ten years.

If there is to be no change in substance, what is the import of the present alteration? M. Troplong confesses it is because the imperial government cannot raise money; it has lost its credit. "Credit, or the employment of other person's power, is of such delicacy that it cannot be treated without due preparation. It is disquieted by surprises; it has confidence only in what is defined." Therefore let the Chamber define the objects of the budget; but let not this definition be so rigid as to be unchangeable; let the Emperor have the prerogative of changing the credits from one section to another, whenever urgent and unforeseen circumstances require it. This, says M. Troplong, is all that M. Fould meant when he said, "The real danger for our finances is in the liberty which the government possesses of decreeing expenses without the control of the legislative power."

If it was all M. Fould meant, M. Fould's report was a very insignificant document; but he probably meant more, which "unforeseen occurrences" made undesirable to carry out at the time. He did not foresee the prospect of war between England and the United States, and the opportunity thereby offered to France for settling the Italian and the Rhenish questions to its own liking. If the political situation of the end of the year could have been foreseen, there would have been no confession of a deficiency of 40,000,000*l.* in the budget, nor any promise of a constitutional change. The confession cannot be recalled, though M. Troplong strives to make it rather a triumph than a penance; the promise, even if it was ever sincere, can easily be evaded, as it is in M. Troplong's report. France, therefore, does not make the least advance in liberty or self-government by this boasted concession. The Emperor, who is no man of business, and does not understand details, was very likely convinced by M. Fould, and has since had his convictions disturbed by persons who saw better than he the real meaning of M. Fould's propositions.

In M. Fould's report, printed in January, he announces his principle by the epigrammatic law, that "in the ordinary budget revenue is based on estimates; in the extraordinary budget estimates are based on the revenue." And he proposes two means for bringing down the extraordinary expenses, and two for raising the ordinary revenue. For the first, he would put an end to the Roman occupation, and reduce the army by 70,000 men. For the second, he would increase the taxation by about 5,000,000*l.* yearly, and decrease the ordinary expenditure by a transformation of the 4½ per-cent debt into 5 per cent; the latter being proportionately at a higher value in the market than the former.

In his speech on opening the Chambers, January 27, the Emperor noticed the preservation of peace during 1861; the visit of the King of Prussia, and the recognition of the Kingdom of Italy; the civil war in America, which though injurious to French commerce, was not to be interfered with so long as the rights of neutrals are respected; the French establishment in Cochin China, and the joint expedition with England and Spain to Mexico. Then he adverted to the deficit, the greatness of which he acknowledged, and at the same time claimed a set-off on account of the immense internal improvements that had been effected in the country during its accumulation, and the military glory that it had helped to purchase. He referred to the distresses which seemed imminent over the labouring population of France, and hoped that they would not hold him responsible for their sufferings; an event that is of common occurrence in despotic monarchies, where the government assumes the functions of providence, and pretends to regulate beforehand all the details of life. He made no mention either of the reduction of the army, or of the Roman occupation.

But the French ambassador at Rome had interchanged communications with Cardinal Antonelli, the dates of which sufficiently prove that they were intended rather for the French Chambers than for the Roman Court. January 11, M. Thouvenel wrote to the ambassador, the Marquis de Lavalette, instructing him that,

though France had sympathies with both sides in the Italian dispute, she could not be responsible for maintaining a state of things that was equally injurious to both sides. He then proceeds: "The question of the day is to learn whether the Pontifical Government intends always to apply to the regulation of its relations with the new *régime* established in the peninsula that inflexibility which is the first of its duties, as it is the most incontestable of its rights, in spiritual affairs; or whether, whatever may be its judgment on the transformation effected in Italy, it will resolve to accept the necessities which follow from this great fact."

It is impossible, he says, to restore the past. Neither Austria, Spain, nor Bavaria, which alone have refused to acknowledge the new state of Italy, thinks of interfering to restore the old.

"Openly proclaimed or tacitly admitted, the principle of non-intervention has become the safeguard of European peace, and the Court of Rome certainly does not expect from foreign aid the means of reconquering the provinces she has lost. I go further: I refuse to believe that the Court of Rome will consent to provoke, in an interest where success would be at least doubtful, conflagrations the most formidable yet recorded in history. Do not the lessons of experience, combined with considerations most fitting to touch the Holy See, command it to resign itself, without renouncing its rights, to a practical arrangement which would restore calm to the bosom of the Catholic world, renew the traditions of the Papacy which has so long covered Italy under its ægis, and bind itself afresh to the new destinies of a nation, cruelly tried, and restored, after so many centuries, to herself?"

"I do not pretend to discuss here any mode of solution. It is sufficient for me to say that the Government of the Emperor has preserved, in this respect, complete liberty of judgment and action; and all that we have to discover now is, whether we ought to cherish or abandon the hope of seeing the Holy See lend itself, keeping account of accomplished facts, to the study of a combination which would assure to the Sovereign Pontiff

the permanent conditions of dignity, security, and independence, necessary to the exercise of his power."

In conclusion, M. Thouvenel points out the great advantage, both to Italy and France, which would arise from the reconciliation of the Pope and the Italian Government.

M. de Lavalette, in a despatch dated January 18th, describes the reception of this communication by the Pontifical Government.

"Without leaving to his Holiness any illusions respecting a restoration of the past, without forgetting the exigencies of a present so intimately connected with our interests, I did not neglect any opportunity of preparing the Holy Father, in general terms, for an arrangement which would answer our most sincere wishes, a reconciliation between Rome and Italy. I found also, in the courteous reception accorded to me, the right to appeal to the confidence of his Holiness, and to seek from him the expression of a hope or a wish, to the realisation of which the government of the Emperor would be happy to be able to contribute."

In his previous interviews with the Pope, the Holy Father had always concluded with the words, "Let us await events;" and Cardinal Antonelli had met every previous offer of compromise with the most unqualified refusal.

"All negotiation," said the Cardinal, on this occasion, "is impossible between the Holy See and those who have despoiled it. It does not depend on the Sovereign Pontiff, it is not in the power of the Sacred College, to cede the smallest portion of ecclesiastical territory."

Lavalette hereupon told the Cardinal that he could not enter into the question of rights or of abstract principles. His only object was a practical one—to offer to the Pontifical Government an opportunity of escaping, while reserving its rights, from a situation as disastrous for its interests as it was menacing to the peace of the Christian world.

This was the Emperor's object, and this was the tenor of the ambassador's instructions. He then read to the Cardinal M. Thouvenel's despatch. We will give Cardinal Antonelli's reply, a reply afterwards endorsed by

the Pope, in M. de Lavalette's words. "I find in this despatch," replied his Eminence, 'the expression of that affectionate interest which you have never ceased to show for us. It is not exactly true, however, that there is disagreement between the Sovereign Pontiff and Italy. Although there may be a rupture between the Holy Father and the Cabinet of Turin, he has none but excellent relations with Italy. An Italian himself, and the first of Italians, he suffers with her sufferings, and witnesses with grief the cruel trials which have troubled the Italian Church. As for making a pact with the despoilers, we will never do it. I can only repeat that all negotiation on this footing is impossible. Whatever might be the reservations with which it was accompanied, with whatever graces of language it might be surrounded, from the moment of accepting it we should appear to consecrate it. The Sovereign Pontiff, before his elevation, as well as the Cardinals since their nomination, have engaged themselves by oath to cede no part of the territories of the Church. The Holy Father, therefore, will make no concession of this nature; a conclave would not have the right to make it; a new Pontiff would be unable to make it; his successors from age to age would be no more free to make it than himself.'

"The calm tone of the Cardinal Secretary of State announced a resolution all the more immovable that it showed his thoughts to be running in a channel which escaped from the discussion. I confined myself to observing to Cardinal Antonelli that the character of his declaration imposed on me the duty of asking him if I could regard it, and transmit it to the Emperor, as the final response of the Holy See. After a moment of reflection, his Eminence offered to refer it to the Holy Father, although it was his conviction that this step was unnecessary. It was a profound sense of duty and obligation that had dictated to his Holiness the solemn declaration which, in his encyclicals and allocutions, he had so frequently made to the entire Catholic world. The Cardinal, therefore, had no difficulty in foreseeing a reply, which, at the same time, he promised to transmit

to me on the morrow, either in writing or by the intermediation of one of his prelates.

"I have this morning received from the Cardinal Secretary of State the note, a translation of which your Excellency will find enclosed. After having received the orders of the Holy Father, his Eminence had nothing to add, nothing to retract, from his declaration of the preceding evening.

"In conclusion, M. le Ministre, your Excellency will consider this question, the exact terms of which I reproduce:—'Ought we to nourish the hope that the Holy See, taking accomplished facts into consideration, will devote itself to the study of a combination which would assure to the Sovereign Pontiff the permanent conditions of dignity, security, and independence necessary to the exercise of his power?'

"It is with profound regret that I find myself obliged to reply in the negative; but I should think myself wanting in my duty if I left you in possession of a hope which I do not entertain myself."*

There is to be very little discussion in the French Chambers on this subject. The draft address of the Senate, in reply to the Emperor's speech, contains the following reference to it:

After declaring that the Emperor has uprightly carried out his Italian programme, and urging him to persevere in the same path of protection and conciliation, the Senate sympathises with him in his regret at finding on one side "immoderate pretensions," and on the other "resistance and immobility." It declares that

* The *Moniteur* of Feb. 20, published the following in its bulletin: "The Government of the Emperor has thought it right to ask explanations from Rome respecting the letter of the Cardinal Prefect of the Council, inviting all the Bishops of Christendom to attend the ceremony of certain martyrs. These explanations have become necessary, because the letter of convocation has been published in France without having been first communicated to the Government. Cardinal Antonelli has replied that the letter addressed to the Bishops was simply a friendly letter of invitation, without any obligatory character, and for a solemnity simply religious. Under these circumstances, the Government has come to the conclusion that the Bishops should not leave their dioceses, or ask permission to leave the empire, unless serious interests connected with their dioceses should call them to Rome."

"calm and moderation" are requisite for achieving a great work, and that without them "the justest causes are led astray by extreme refusals, and are incompatible with the good conduct of human affairs."

The address, which gives no ground for expecting any immediate change in the relations between France, Italy, and the Holy See, is occupied chiefly with the internal affairs of France; the distress arising from the commercial stagnation caused by the American civil war, and increased by the insufficient harvest of last year. It still recommends non-intervention and neutrality in relation to America, because the only way to shorten the struggle is to abstain from interfering in it; and has nothing to propose for the relief of the distress, which has not yet come to its worst, but a development of those public works which have for so many years past afforded food to the dangerous portion of the population. In the absence of a poor-law, and with the Society of St. Vincent of Paul dissolved, it is hard to see what other resource was open to the government.

Besides recommending the government to undertake this organisation of labour, the senators lament that its funds will not be sufficient to undertake a like control of literature and education, as if in these points the second Empire intended to imitate the first. The ecclesiastical policy of the government is also significantly indicated by the recommendation of an increase of salary to the secular clergy, whose poverty is contrasted with the ampler means of the regulars—"abundant private liberality seeks out religious congregations." The address concludes by contrasting the Emperor's policy of "legitimate interests" with the "policy of passion," which characterises the other parties in France; a comparison which exactly tallies with the ancient distinction of expediency and principle which has divided mankind from very early times.

It would be absurd to suppose that Bonapartism in France is not as much a passion as Legitimism. The empire rests partly on the adhesion of the Bonapartists, partly on the division and on the fears of the other parties. But the contrast drawn by

the Senate may be illustrated in the conduct of the liberal Catholic party in France during the uncertainty of the *Trent* affair. This party can amuse itself with "the charming simplicity of the English character, that measures the morality of foreign governments by their convenience to England alone;" but during the uncertainty of the *Trent* affair it seemed to measure the morality of our dealings with America solely by the effect they had on the French government. The government taking our part was sufficient reason for the opposition to take part against us, to justify Capt. Wilkes, to endorse Mr. Sumner's precedents, to declare that England had been waiting for years for the opportunity to crush its old rival, enemy, and rebel, the great historical creation of France, her faithful ally and customer, the United States. "C'est la passion de prendre une éclatante revanche de la révolution des Etats-Unis," said the *Correspondant* of December, "c'est l'envie de profiter de la situation périlleuse de ce peuple, autrefois le sujet, aujourd'hui le rival d'Angleterre, pour le couper en morceaux, pour détruire sa puissance nationale, commerciale, maritime. Ce peuple est notre œuvre, notre allié, notre client; il est, au contraire, le rebelle, l'ennemi, le rival d'Angleterre;" and adds, in condemnation of the Emperor's policy: "If France, for her own purposes, is glad to see England occupied with the New World, and somewhat inattentive to the old,—if she cries out with Manchester, Let America perish rather than the cotton-trade,—she will countenance and help England, blame the United States, and let the storm grow more furious against the work of Washington; a part not very agreeable to England, who is strong enough to settle her quarrels without help, and disgraceful to us, as it sets three upon one, and gains a victory too easy to be glorious." No stronger example could be given of the policy of passion and feeling, as contrasted with the policy of "legitimate interests;" and there is no party among those which divide the allegiance of European politicians less devoted to principle than that whose organ we have quoted. A legitimate interest may be made by a party the standard

of its political views, and it will then form a system in harmony with its interests, but in which certain definite political principles may be appealed to. The interests of a certain class of English industry have given rise to a consistent political system in the Manchester school. Writers like Lamennais and Ventura were guided by what they held to be the interests of the Church to distinct political doctrines, in whose efficacy and truth they too sincerely believed to sacrifice or renounce them in obedience to the apparent interests of the moment. But by the liberal Catholics of France no principle is ever enunciated that will not under certain circumstances be abandoned; no political truth is sacred enough in their eyes not to be overruled by considerations of religious interests, or by the sympathies or the prejudices of the hour. Friends of the Italian war, they condemned the Italian revolution; lovers of the independence of Italy, they oppose her unity. They applaud the expulsion of the Austrians because the Austrians are foreigners; and they would tolerate no resistance to the Pope, however oppressive or absolute his government might be. There is something in the fanaticism and ribaldry of Veuillot that is manly and consistent, in comparison with writers such as these, whose principles are adopted or abandoned at the dictation of an interest, whose language varies with the hour and the latitude, who defend a cause in which they do not believe, and resist the truths which they know.

The conformity of the French government to the character of the nation is exhibited very distinctly and very involuntarily in the character of some of those parties which most actively oppose it. The distinction between the acts of the Emperor and the spirit of the people—the leading fallacy of the enemies of Napoleon III.—is religiously maintained by the Catholic liberals. The glory of their country helped to reconcile them to the Italian war, but its inevitable consequences are made a reproach to the Emperor. Their traditional hatred of Austria is nourished as much by Austrian liberty as by Austrian despotism. Their attack on the policy of their government in the American

quarrel is compensated for by adulation of the people, and of its great deeds of old. Even in the reverence for the old French constitution, that which preponderates is a love for its forms. Their opposition is confined to the ruling system, and does not extend, like that of Tocqueville, to the whole condition of society and of political thought in the country, by which that system is sustained. No great improvement can therefore be anticipated in the government of France from the victory of the educated malcontents. The constitutional government they would introduce would be as absolute as that which is now so bitterly assailed. It would possess neither greater securities of stability nor greater safeguards against abuse; it would be neither limited nor fenced by the orders of the State, and its authority would be conterminous with its might. No other description of authority can keep order in a State threatened with a social revolution. And this is the meaning of the distinction which is justly drawn between interests and passions, which with unprincipled men is the term for principles, just as fanaticism is the name given by the irreligious to piety, and superstition to faith. A government founded on interests, not on rights, neither appeals to its own right nor recognises that of others. Expediency is the supreme law in its reciprocal relations with the people. It relies for popularity on the claims it successively acquires, not for reverence on the right it originally possessed. All those things which invalidate authority—usurpation, despotism, revolution, aggression, and the refusal to admit the control either of law or of force—taint, but do not weaken it. Possessing no moral power, no protection in the sense of duty, no right to the obedience of the people, it provides a substitute for all that it wants in the increase of physical power, and in measures which gain over the popular interests. It has not the means of passing from absolutism to a regulated power, for it cannot acquire those securities on which all lawful government rests. Diminution of force is a loss of security, and the concession of safeguards is the surrender of an outwork. But it finds a

resource in the passions as well as in the interests of the people, and satisfies the first by its policy abroad, the other by its policy at home. In both respects it contrasts strongly with legitimate governments, which are obeyed for the sake of the past as much as for the sake of the future, and which continue in spite of unpopularity and weakness, claiming respect for what they are, and not for what they do.

Population.

It was formerly believed that the strength and prosperity of a State depended on its actual numbers. Every encouragement was given to the increase of the population by early marriages, and by the abolition of certain moral impediments. The removal of the restrictions on trade was one of the fruits of this belief. Malthus's book appeared and caused a revolution; for half a century afterwards the tendency was to dread the excess of population, to encourage emigration, and to attribute the pressure of poverty to an excess of numbers.

Thinness of population, carried to a certain point, promotes slavery, as the only way to secure labour. Carried farther still, it leads to barbarism, and to the dominion of nature over man. For nature is only overcome by combination of labour. This is one reason why the dwellers on the frontiers of civilisation sink to a lower level of civilisation, like the trappers and pioneers in America. The degree of coincidence between a high population and social prosperity depends on the proportion of numbers to the means of subsistence. If food cannot be produced, or provided by commerce at the price the people can pay, the population is in excess.

A population relatively less compact may be better off than that of a more thickly populated State, if it commands a proportionably greater amount of natural resources. For then an equal amount of labour will produce greater results. The advantage depends also on the distribu-

tion of the inhabitants. If that is very unequal, it is an evil. The packing of our population in our manufacturing towns tends to give them a morbid influence on the whole country, as their condition makes our policy dependent on material considerations, and destroys its imperial character, by causing a particular social influence to predominate over reasons of State. But then our manufacturing districts do not suck in the people from rural districts, and depopulate other countries to the same extent as the French towns depopulate the agricultural departments. In France, certain departments increase enormously at the expense of many more. This is by no means a healthy increase.

The substance of the Malthusian law is, that population must not be directly encouraged, because its benefit depends on the presence of certain conditions, the first of which is the supply of food. Increase of means of subsistence produces naturally an increase of population. Increase of population without the corresponding increase of means is ruinous to the State.

Quick and regular increase of population is therefore a necessary sign of prosperity. Where it fails, something essential is wanting in the moral or the physical order.

In England, although the growth of the people is a source of distress, it is a sign of prosperity. It is better that the excess should be drained away by emigration, and the distress relieved by poor's-rate, than that the elasticity of the race should be at an end. The rapid increase proves the growth of cultivation, the refinement of labour, and the intensity of production. Our wealth and our productive power have grown more rapidly than our population, and our poor's-rates have diminished.

In France the census of the population is taken every five years.

The following table shows the growth of the nation from the beginning of the century to 1861, the census of which year has just been published:

1801	27,349,003						
1806	29,107,425	total increase, 1,758,422; annual increase, 351,685					
1821	30,461,875	„	„	1,354,450	„	„	90,292

1826	31,858,937	total increase, 1,397,062; annual increase, 279,415			
1831	32,569,223	"	"	858,937	171,787
1836	33,540,910	"	"	971,687	194,337
1841	34,217,719	"	"	676,809	135,362
1846	35,400,486	"	"	1,182,767	236,553
1851	35,783,170	"	"	382,684	76,537
1856	36,039,364	"	"	256,194	51,236
1861	36,713,166				
Savoy and Nice	669,059				
		37,382,225		673,802	134,760

Thus the population has regained some of the elasticity which it seemed to have lost in the frightful return of 1856, though the improvement is due solely to an improved sanitary condition, and to a diminished average of deaths, and not to greater productivity. In the first half of the eighteenth century, the increase of population was only 33,000 a year, or about 1 for every 600 inhabitants. From 1821 to 1826 it was nearly 280,000 a year, or about 1 in 114 inhabitants. But it is remarkable that the births in the last century were not so very different in number from those in the present. In 1782 there were 975,703 births in a population of about 24,000,000, somewhat less than 1 in 26; and in 1822 there were only 972,632 births in a population of about 30,500,000, somewhat more than 1 in 31; so that the absolute fertility of the race had diminished enormously in 1822. Thirty years later, in 1852, the births were only 964,959 in a population of about 35,900,000, not quite 1 in 37, showing a progressive diminution in the vitality of the race, which contrasts curiously with the vigorous vitality of the French Canadians, who, in spite of not being recruited by emigration, not only keep up, but manage slightly to improve, their relative proportion to the rest of the inhabitants of the colony.

Thus the greater increase of the population of France in this century has not been due to any increased productive vigour, but to sanitary causes which have prolonged the average of life. In 1782 the deaths were 948,502, only 27,201 below the number of births; in 1822 the deaths were 777,037, or 195,595 below the births; and in 1852 they were 810,737, or 154,222 below the births. The excess of births over deaths was greatest in the period between 1811 and

1820, and seems to have been gradually diminishing ever since, in consequence of the lessening of the proportionate birth-rate to the number of the population.

And the population, thus stationary in numbers, ever tends to a fresh local distribution. The towns are continually sucking the people from the country; and the artisans are multiplying at the expense of the peasantry. The census of 1856 showed that this alteration had been progressing with extraordinary rapidity during the five preceding years. There had been an actual decrease in the population of 54 departments, and an increase only in 32. The census of 1861 shows that in the next five years 57 departments progressed, while only 29 went backwards. Still the tendency is towards accumulating masses of people in the towns, and thinning the population of the agricultural districts. In the department of the Seine the increase is 13 per cent; in those of the north and the mouth of the Rhone it is 7 per cent in the four years. This shows how the people must have immigrated from the country into Paris and other great towns, and explains how the policy of the Empire has come to be dependent upon the caprices and the necessities of the town populations, though the Empire itself was founded on the votes of the rural inhabitants.

In order to see how this packing of the population affects its power and vitality, we must not only look at the absolute average of births, but we must also separate the legitimate from the illegitimate; for the increase of births out of marriage is no element of national strength; the number of such children reared to maturity is proportionately small. Of those who live, through defect of education, neglect, and the want of position, a great

proportionate number becomes sunk in the dangerous and criminal part of the people. And the rest, being without property or kin, add to the mass of pauperism. And we must compare the relative fecundity of marriages with respect to the distribution of the population.

According to the rate of annual increase in France, from 1851 to 1856, the population would double in 405 years; that of England actually doubled in the first half of the present century, besides sending out some 4,000,000 emigrants. In several European countries, such as Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, the average mortality is higher than in France; but nowhere is the average rate of births so low. The birth-rate, not the absolute increase of population, is the test of vitality and productivity; for a high average of births may be counteracted by a still higher rate of mortality, which may prove nothing against the national vitality. It is only when the natural increase of the population, which ought in the most favourable circumstances to be 3 per cent annually, is prevented by the low rate of births, that we are able to conclude that deep moral causes are at work, and that the population is becoming worn out. Thus the evil condition of France is not expressed by the figures of actual increase or decrease; but it must be sought for in a deeper analysis of the figures which make up the census.

From 1830 the population went on increasing, though at a slower and slower rate; but the number of births diminished both absolutely and relatively.

With regard to relative decrease, in 1801 there were 3.33 births to 100 inhabitants; 1821, 3.07; 1831, 3.03; 1841, 2.82; 1851, 2.70; 1856, 2.61. The average of births annually, compared to the population in France, from 1844 to 1853, was 1 to 35.82, or of children born alive (the only ones worth reckoning as far as the State interests go) only 1 to 37.16. In no other state was the proportion worse than 1 to 34.35 (Belgium), generally much higher. In England, 1 to 30.06. In other states, 1 to 26 or 28.

The absolute diminution of births in France is shown by the following figures:

	Population.		Births.
1851 35,783,170	1,008,824
1853 35,885,648	975,537

The increase of the population of the great towns, at the expense of the country, diminishes the fruitfulness of the people, and increases their immorality.

In Paris the annual births are 1 to 32 of the inhabitants; in the other towns 1 to 35; in the country 1 to 41: so that the actual births are more numerous in great towns. But each marriage in Paris has on an average only 2.31 children; in the provinces 3.28: so that the legitimate fruitfulness is weakened. Whereas illegitimate children in Paris are 27.19 per cent of births; in the country 7.7. And it is to be remarked that the fecundity of marriages has gone on regularly decreasing in France ever since the beginning of the century. In fifty years it has diminished 25 per cent.

Since the population has increased, though the number of births has fallen off, the mortality must have diminished, and consequently the average length of life must have increased. But this social improvement need not imply health or vigour, for it is without productivity. For military purposes, that is, for the State, the greater length of life is nothing in comparison with the greater abundance of births. It must also be remembered that a lower birth-rate diminishes at a still greater rate the proportion of deaths, as deaths are more numerous among new-born children than among adults. Malthus (*Principles of Population*, ii. cap. 4 and 5) shows that marriages and births follow more rapidly where deaths are more frequent; i. e. that a greater mortality involves a greater productivity; whereas a long-lived population has the fewest births to show.

Vitality is shown more in fecundity than in diminished mortality. On the other hand, fecundity itself is no good unless children are reared. All who cannot be reared, but die before they can restore to society the expenses of their childhood, had, for the State's interest, better not have been born.

Now, on looking at the population tables, we find that France is above

all other European countries in the proportionate number of its adult population of thirty years old and upwards, and below them all in its proportion of children. England stands at the head of all countries for its large proportion of children under fifteen years of age—36,047 in every 100,000 inhabitants. Then come Prussia, Piedmont, Denmark, Saxony, Styria, and Belgium. France is last of all. England also stands at the head of all for its proportion of individuals from fifteen to twenty years of age, and here also the minimum is in France; so for individuals between twenty and thirty, the maximum is in England, the minimum in France. After the age of thirty years the tables are turned: France has the maximum of persons between thirty and forty (14,700 in 100,000), England the minimum (12,182); and the same results appear for all succeeding ages. Of old and middle-aged men France has the maximum among all the states of Europe, and England the minimum.

How shall we account for this? Partly, no doubt, that persons of less than thirty years die off faster in France than in any other country, and that persons past thirty have greater chance of living to old age in France than elsewhere. Still this account is insufficient. It is clear that the result is partly caused by the continually diminishing birth-rate. Among an equal number of inhabitants fewer children are born in France than elsewhere, and in proportion to the number born fewer survive to the age of thirty years than in any other country. Its numbers are kept up by the longevity of its adult population, not by a profuse reproduction. In England, on the contrary, our numbers are made up by the swarms of

children. Ours is a young country, France is an old country; we are an increasing, overflowing people; the French are nearly stationary. We can afford to live in hope, and wait for the future; their interest is to expend themselves on the present.

It is remarkable that the number of illegitimate births should be so low in France—about $7\frac{3}{4}$ per cent of the whole number of births. It shows that similar causes depress the numbers both of legitimate and illegitimate births. This shows that the number of illegitimate children in proportion to the rest, or in proportion to the whole population, is no perfect test of the morality of that population. Various considerations must come in before it can be used for this purpose. Probably the best way would be to compare the numbers of such births with the number of unmarried women between the ages of fifteen and thirty-five.

The Minister of the Interior declares himself satisfied with the result of the census. It shows, he says, that "under the influence of general prosperity and well-being, the population inclines towards a normal progress." But it shows also that a population where only 319 children are produced annually under the Second Empire from the same number of married couples as produced 430 children annually in the beginning of the century, cannot again expend its blood at the same rate as it did during the wars of the First Empire. In 1854 and 1855, the cholera, a short harvest, and the Crimean war, caused an actual reduction of 69,318 and 37,274 for the two years. In the most disastrous years of the First Empire the annual increase was never less than 114,000.